

THE
CHRISTIAN REFORMER;
OR,
UNITARIAN
MAGAZINE AND REVIEW.

NEW SERIES, VOL. XV.

FROM JANUARY TO DECEMBER, 1859.

LONDON:
EDWARD T. WHITFIELD, 178, STRAND.
—
1859.

HACKNEY:
PRINTED BY CHARLES GREEN.

P R E F A C E.

At the close of the Fifteenth year of unremunerated editorial labour, the Conductor of this Magazine ventures to make another appeal to the friends of Unitarianism on behalf of the *CHRISTIAN REFORMER*. His sole object has hitherto been, and will hereafter be, to promote the instruction and the increased zeal and usefulness of the religious denomination with which it is his happiness to be associated. While desiring to uphold with a firm hand Christianity as a divine revelation, and Unitarianism as the true exposition of Christianity, the Editor has always freely opened his pages to all the seekers after Truth, of every shade of religious opinion, whose knowledge and literary ability entitle them to a public hearing. He respects the principle of the freedom of the religious press too much to refuse to those from whom he may have differed in opinion, the opportunity of explanation and defence. He may perhaps be allowed to refer with satisfaction to the volume now completed, in proof of the usefulness of the Magazine. In its biographical articles it furnishes the future historian of liberal Christianity in England with materials for which in other quarters he would seek in vain. In the other departments of the work there has been (thanks to the ability of his contributors) the reflection of the light of a free and catholic faith on the literature, incidents and controversies of the age. Never, the Editor believes, was a Magazine conducted on the principles of the *CHRISTIAN REFORMER* more needed than at the present time. He therefore asks his friends to do what they can in giving it *increased circulation*. Without expecting pecuniary remuneration for his labours, he feels entitled by past services to ask for such an amount of support as will protect him from future anxiety and loss. If that support be given, he will cheerfully, while health and strength are his, continue his labours in a cause in which he believes are involved Truth, Freedom and Charity.

1, *Frampton Villas, South Hackney.*



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CLXIX.]

JANUARY, 1859.

[VOL. XV.

PROTESTANTISM AND THE FINE ARTS.*

THE Coquerel family includes some of the most earnest, devoted and talented pastors of the French Protestant Church, and is, to English ears especially, representative of the great cause of religious freedom and progress in France. Father and (we believe) three sons have devoted their eminent gifts to this sacred calling. The father's principal work, *Le Christianisme Experimental*, was introduced to English readers ten or eleven years ago by the Rev. D. Davison (whose decease we have this month the sad office of recording). In the author's English Preface to that translation, it will be remembered that he gives a very interesting account of his early life and education under the care of his aunt and adoptive mother, Helen Maria Williams, and expresses the most generous admiration and sympathy towards England and the English. "Though a Frenchman by birth, though my whole life has been spent on the Continent, I was brought up half an Englishman." "We enjoyed" (that is, his brother Charles and himself) "the singular advantage of speaking two maternal languages; and one of the earliest lessons we were taught was the long and ancient ties of our family with England and Scotland."

To these two "maternal languages," his accomplished son, the author of the book on Italian Religious Art now before us, added the early acquisition of the Italian language in great perfection, together with a devoted love to the literature and art of that historic land, as infused into his young mind by a most noble-hearted and highly-gifted Italian lady, who lived her married life and died in Paris, and to whose memory this book is affectionately and gracefully dedicated. The English Preface includes a brief memoir of her most interesting life, concluding thus:

"When I add that this gifted woman, during seventeen years, shewed me a motherly kindness, taught me her native tongue, accustomed my northern ear to its melody, read with me the poets of Italy,—commented with glowing enthusiasm upon the master-works of Italian art, often

* The Fine Arts in Italy in their Religious Aspect: Letters from Rome, Naples, Pisa, &c.; with an Appendix on the Iconography of the Immaculate Conception. By Ath. Coquerel, Junior, Suffragan Pastor of the Reformed Church, Paris. Translated from the French by Edward and Emily Higginson; with Corrections and Additions and an English Preface by the Author. Post 8vo. Pp. 287.

in the Louvre galleries, oftener among the prints and drawings she delighted in,—and lastly made me personally acquainted with proscribed and illustrious patriots whose perils she had shared,—my partiality to Italy ought to be excused, if indeed any excuse be needed. As often as I meet with any opportunity to shew my respectful sympathy to Italy's noble exiles, to such men as the deeply lamented Marin or my eminent and justly admired friend Montanelli, it seems to me that I do but pay a debt, not only the debt all generous hearts owe to those who suffer for the common cause of mankind, but the debt of one who has been blessed with the friendship of Bianca Mojon, and who must cherish, with religious scrupulousness, feelings and purposes that have been hers. When I write her revered name on the first page of this volume, that name, though little known to the world, is to me the representative of Protestant Christianity, of Italian Liberty and of immortal Art, all blended together in rare and sublime harmony. May the day come when true religion, established freedom, and art restored to something of its ancient glory, shall grace that unhappy land, so often betrayed and so shamefully oppressed! Without the first, neither the second nor the third are to be hoped for.

“Such are the firm belief and fervent wish that embolden me to hallow, with the name of my long-departed friend, these few desultory pages, rendered less unworthy perhaps of so great an honour, were it only from a depth of feeling and conviction she would have smiled upon.”—Pp. xii, xiii.

Such thoroughly idiomatic English as the above extract is perfectly wonderful, to have proceeded from the pen of a foreigner, and makes us think Mons. Coquerel might almost have been his own translator, doing as full justice to our tongue as to his own meaning. Occasional passages in this Preface, however, betray the foreigner in a most genuine and acceptable manner, while its whole contents (we ought to attest) are a very valuable addition to the book as it originally appeared in French. Mons. Coquerel equals Montalambert in his admiring sympathy with England, breathed in connection with his sorrowing yet hopeful sympathy towards Italy. He is a true Luther in his free and confiding Protestantism. He is all that an ardent love of beauty joined with cultivated taste and pure Christian feeling can make him in relation to Sacred Art.

We quote his tribute to our own country with which the Preface opens :

“I trust that English readers will consider much less the temerity of a foreigner, in attempting, somewhat rashly perhaps, to borrow their language, than the homage he wishes to pay to their literature and to them. I am born of a family in which deep feelings of reverence for the British people, admiration for their poets and statesmen, brotherly love for themselves as fellow Protestants, religious pride in the glorious liberties they mainly owe to their bold and unflinching fidelity to the spirit of the Reformation, are a part of the household education, and, if I may say so, an heirloom. Such were the early convictions impressed on my mind by an elderly kinswoman, whose poems and political cor-

respondence have been, in their time, received with applause in her own country,—Helen Maria Williams. Since those days many and eventful years have passed, but nothing has occurred to change my sentiments; and at a time when even the most renowned and the less tolerant among Roman Catholic statesmen in France deeply testify their enthusiasm for British freedom of speech, thought and conscience, it is only natural for a Minister of the Gospel to nourish the same feelings.”—Pp. v, vi.

We must also let him explain in his own words the theme which he has undertaken to maintain, as a Protestant lover of the Fine Arts, in opposition to the ever-repeated claims of Roman Catholicism to be regarded as their especial or only foster-mother :

“Even in England, where there is no lack of anti-Roman controversy, and where the Fine Arts, especially of late, have attracted more and more the enlightened notice of all classes,—even in England the question I venture to touch upon has never, to my knowledge, been thoroughly attended to. We let Roman Catholicism boast and brag unceasingly about its alliance with Art, and preach, and write, and print every day that the Papal Church is the foster-mother of the Fine Arts, and their only efficient support on earth. Now, if this be true, Protestantism is decidedly inferior to Romanism, and decidedly in the wrong as to one of the noblest realms of mental activity, as to the use of one of the Almighty’s most precious gifts. This I pretend to disprove. And the whole of my arguments, as may be seen in the following *Letters*, are facts,—facts observed and studied on the spot, in Rome and through Italy.”—Pp. vi, vii.

We heartily thank Mons. Coquerel, alike in the name of Protestantism and in the love of Art, for thus taking up the gauntlet so vauntingly thrown down. It has lain too long unnoticed at our feet. He is right, we believe, in saying that even in Protestant England, where the Fine Arts have, especially of late, attracted increasing notice, this insolent challenge has been idly neglected. We are not aware, any more than he, of any English writer who has “pretended,” or undertaken, to disprove the “unceasing brag.” We have also to say that, in our opinion, Mons. Coquerel has made out his point most decisively. He has not dissembled any of the true claims of Catholic art. He has not shewn himself insensible, but quite the reverse, to high merit any where. He has dealt out his praise to high art, whether Catholic, Pagan or simply Christian, with no niggard hand. But he has found the true strength of his position in distinguishing between the Pagan and Christian monuments of art in Italy, and again between what is simply Christian and what is specifically Roman Catholic. And he has brought proof upon proof that in these last instances, the artistic inspiration which exists is not that of Catholicism *quasi* Catholicism ; and that the distinctive office of the Church in Italy has been, to destroy or debase the remains of ancient Greek and Roman art, or strangely to mix up even the indecencies of its heathenism with the places and

offices of Christian worship ; and, in the production of works of her own, to reduce genius to the level of conventionalism, to prescribe theologically or ecclesiastically what the painter or sculptor ought to be left to conceive for himself, and to require the execution of impossible or absurd subjects which are not artistic, but are Catholic. The very fact that the Catholic demand for works of art is entirely religious and strictly subject to ecclesiastical conditions, precludes the artist from every subject beyond the Bible and Church tradition. Nature and human life at large are *non-Catholic*. The fact, too, that Catholic paintings are chiefly used as Church decorations, is fatal to the true claims of art, since the demands of worship and those of art are not identical, sometimes they are inconsistent. All this our author shews by instance upon instance.

He has thus summed up his conclusions :

“ We by no means dispute that, in the infancy of modern Art, Catholicism (or rather the Christian element contained in Catholicism) more than once gave happy inspiration to artists. But we affirm that this same Catholicism held them under the yoke and restrained their progress. The authority of the clergy and the reign of tradition pressed upon them with fatal weight. From the moment when art, stimulated by the Renaissance and emancipated by study, was again put in possession of nature and of the ancient ideal, it felt itself free and produced masterpieces that were no longer Catholic, but were human. Leonardo da Vinci, Raphael, Michel Angelo, with their schools and rival schools, were born of this movement. As painters, sculptors and architects, these great men were pre-eminently men of creative genius, thinkers.

“ I do not call them men of free thought, because I never understood that phrase. Thought is free, or else it does not exist; a thinker in bonds, a thinker whose meditations recognize as the supreme law the obligation of arriving at a foregone conclusion, does not think at all; at the very most, he argues, which is a very different thing. To find the shortest road, or even the most beautiful, from a fixed starting-point to an equally fixed goal, is, no doubt, a problem that may be proposed to writer or artist, and possesses the interest of a gymnastic exercise, that kind of attraction which certain minds seem to feel for feats of skill. Neither genius nor the feeling of art has any concern in this operation; which may be ingenious, but is mechanical. And this is all that Catholicism can command.

“ Here, and in all that precedes, we are in opposition to the Ultramontane party. The theory which stops short at Perugino and admires no art but what is anterior to the Renaissance, may be logical; but it has against it the sole decisive proof in such a matter as this, the proof before which one can only bow in silence—the evidence of the Beautiful. It is absolutely false to say that art degenerated from the time of Raphael’s master; though it is true that the religious sentiment, that fruitful source of art and poetry, ceases to assert itself from that moment.

“ But why is this? Because the Catholic hierarchy had given to religious art an ecclesiastical and sacerdotal character, from which it had to work out its freedom.

"To sum up what we have said: In spite of what seems to us the too great prominence given by Catholicism to the arts in its worship, it would be stopping short of the truth to say that the Roman Church has never for a moment been able to sustain them at their true elevation. She has precipitated their fall by a thrice fatal influence; by materializing religion continually more and more, which is the mortal sore of Catholicism; by running after the colossal and enormous instead of the beautiful, which is the disease of Roman taste; and by sacrificing art to costly display, which is the scheme of the Jesuits.

"The work of future masters must be, to separate the thought and feeling of the Beautiful from this false and dangerous traditionalism which has paralyzed or dried them up. Then only, when independent and spontaneous, will they develope themselves widely and live their own native life."—Pp. 218—220.

And in looking hopefully to a better future (in connection immediately with French art), he thus vindicates the healthy and natural connection of Protestantism with the love and pursuit of art. How just is his allusion to Milton, and to the Puritan love of Beauty as seeking to indemnify itself in poetry!

"Will national art, or Christian art, spring up again among us and assert its freedom? For this end it will not suffice to borrow coldly from the ancients, well or ill understood, outline, form and design; nor to recover the lost palette of Giorgione or Titian, and dash its most brilliant colours impetuously on the canvas; besides this, it will be necessary to study the works of God with love and faith, like Palissy; to render their beauties with ingenuous freshness and grace, like Jean Goujon; and to think with as much elevation of mind and feel with as much soul as Ary Scheffer.

"Are not these great names enough to prove the radical fallacy of that prejudice, often allowed without reply by Protestants themselves, to the effect that Protestantism is essentially hostile to the fine arts? If such were the fact, that fact would condemn our church and our faith; for the artistic sense is a high gift of the Creator; it is one of the *talents* which we are ordered to improve; and any religion which should repudiate the Beautiful or forbid the love and study of it, would mutilate and abase man instead of regenerating all his powers. It is quite true that the Puritans, with mistaken severity, proscribed most of the forms of Beauty. They were wrong; but let us be just even towards them, and not forget that the Imagination, when banished by them from all the domains of art, save one, when strictly confined to the range of poetry, sought the Beautiful under this, which is the least material form of any, and found what the genius of France will for ever miss, an epic. Milton is the Homer of Protestantism; nor has Italian Catholicism, in spite of Tasso and Ariosto, anything comparable to the *gigantesca sublimità Miltoniana*. All the grandeur of Michel Angelo is found in Milton, with more love, more faith, more purity; nor can his faults for which he has been so much reproached, militate against the bold elevation and incomparable power of his genius. The twofold poetry of Protestantism, that of the Bible and that of personal faith, is found in his works, in all its energy and grandeur, its religious depth, and its richness of colour and imagery.

"Like Milton in England, and like Luther in Germany (Luther, endowed by nature with such vigorous poetical and artistic powers!)—the illustrious French Protestants whom I have named, prove by the evidence of fact that the glories of the Imagination are not forbidden us.

"But there is more to be said on this point. We think it clear that the time is past, never to return, when religious art was mere matter of pomp. Painters, sculptors, architects! would you create? Would you attain what is, after all, the supreme end of art, a high originality? Would you be your true selves, fruitful and powerful? Be well assured that you can only express greatly what you have thought or felt freely. Be assured that there is no moral force equal to inward force, no life and freshness of imagination comparable to that of a soul at once independent and believing. The individual spirituality, the free faith, the frank spontaneous piety of the Protestant, can alone open to you this glorious career. There alone is the sacred fire kindled. There alone breathes the breath of life. There alone is the conquest of the Future assured to you.

"It is indeed full time that a new order of art should arise in France; art free and individual, and therein national, and moreover deeply and ardently Christian. This is one of our most fervent desires; and if these fugitive letters should have been the means of raising to the height of this hope the ambition of some artist, unknown perhaps but deeply believing and highly gifted, we should thank God with lively joy."—Pp. 224—227.

But we must indicate more particularly the varied contents of this charming book.

The first two letters are from Naples, the most Catholic town in the world, and where the monuments of Greek, Roman and Gothic art have been tastelessly and unrelentingly destroyed or deformed. The history of St. Philomena, who sits in splendid attire on the altar of the principal church of the Jesuits in this city, is given in the author's liveliest style:

"I may be allowed here to tell, in a few words, who St. Philomena was. She was born of a philological conjecture in 1802. There was found, in the catacomb of Priscilla, in Rome, a skeleton under a broken stone, on which were distinguishable the olive-branch and the anchor, emblems common to Christian tombs, and also two arrows and a javelin, which seemed to indicate the tomb of some martyr. These insignia were accompanied by an inscription, the beginning and end of which were wanting: — *lumena pax tecum fi* —. No sense could be made of it; *lumena* is the end of an unknown name or word, *fi* the beginning of another word. A cunning fellow relieved the embarrassment of the Romish clergy. He wrote the undecipherable inscription in a circle, and thus joined the syllable *fi* to the maimed word *lumena*; and thenceforth the whole thing meant, 'Peace to thee, Philomena!' This name, which signifies *beloved*, seemed charming; and thus the saint was constructed whole and intire out of the end of one word and the beginning of another.

"On the return of Pius VII. to Rome, a Neapolitan prelate, who was sent to congratulate the holy father, received from him the body of this unknown saint. Immediately, a priest who desired that his name should

not be mentioned (*so great was his humility*), saw an apparition of the saint;—she informed him that she had suffered martyrdom, because, having taken the vow of celibacy, she had refused to marry the emperor. These historical details seemed full of interest, but insufficient. An artist had, in turn, a vision, in which this amorous but cruel emperor was pointed out to him under the name of Diocletian. Yet there is a disposition to relieve his memory from this posthumous charge; so it is supposed that the artist may have misunderstood, and that the person concerned was Diocletian's colleague, Maximilian, who, as is well known, was less delicate than he, and was quite capable of punishing with death a refusal which mortified him.

“Thanks to the Jesuits, this Saint Philomena succeeded rapidly; already she has chapels in many churches in Paris; and in this way, in the 19th century, out of some unidentified bones and a few incoherent syllables, has been created a Name, a Personage, a whole Legend and a new Worship.”—Pp. 8—10.

Another saint, “whose history is only too real,” that of the Inquisitor Peter the Martyr, contrasts horribly with that of Philomena, “whose only fault is her never having existed.” We must pass him by, and also St. Januarius (better known to Protestants), to quote M. Coquerel on the subject of Black Virgins:

“An odd Italian fancy much cherished by the Neapolitans is the worship of Black Virgins.

“This very ancient superstition is, to confess the truth, only an exaggeration of a correct idea. The European complexion of Raphael's beautiful Virgins, is more agreeable, no doubt, but historically less probable, it being natural to suppose that Mary was rather dark, as is the case with the women of Palestine in general. Accordingly, this colour has always been given, as a stamp of authenticity, to the innumerable Madonnas ascribed to Saint Luke: even if one of these strange and often very ancient paintings is become darker through the effect of time, this fault is religiously imitated as an excellence of the original picture and a proof of its fidelity. Tradition and legend have, as usual, aided this popular prepossession. In the 14th century, the monk Nicephorus Callistus gave, in his Ecclesiastical History, a description of Mary's person, and guaranteed its correctness on the authority of Epiphanius. There we read that the Virgin's complexion was *wheat-coloured*; a comparison which is found also in reference to Jesus Christ, in a forged letter to the Senate in the name of an imaginary Publius Lentulus, Procurator of Judea. Finally, it has been discovered in the Old Testament, that the mother of the Saviour was brown; and this by a very simple process; namely, by applying to Mary the words of the Bride in Solomon's Song: ‘I am black, but comely, O ye daughters of Jerusalem; as the tents of Kedar, as the curtains of Solomon;’ which expression suggests the very deep colour of that camel-hair cloth of which tents are made in the East, and for which, in later times, Cilicia gained a proverbial celebrity. Whether the Italian people are acquainted or not with these good reasons, professedly historical, they hold fair Virgins in little estimation, and doubt their being true likenesses. But at Naples they do not stop there: the blacker a Madonna is, the more she is venerated: so you often see images as black as negresses, on those frail erections of

gilded trellis garlanded with lemons, oranges and leaves, which serve as shops, in the open air, for the picturesque dealers in water and snow (*acquaiuoli*). One of the strangest figures of this kind is found in the parish church of a popular quarter of the city, *Santa-Maria-di-Porta-Nuova*. It is loaded with rich silk garments, stretched flat upon the wall; above these draperies and under an enormous crown, shining all over with gold and jewels, there projects from the wall, in full relief, an absolutely black head; it is the Virgin's. A few inches lower, exactly beneath the first head, under a no less sparkling crown, stands out another head equally black,—that of the Infant Jesus. This is as hideous as it is absurd; more stiff and hard than a Byzantine image; but the people have all the more faith in it. Weak minds are caught and amused by anything monstrous.”—Pp. 25—27.

The next letters are from Rome, occupying nearly half the volume. The view of St. Peter's in the distance had deeply impressed the traveller; but on entering the city, he was disappointed and distressed to find the false taste “which had dogged him at Naples” reigning as absolutely, though less frivolously, here, especially in the modern statues from the time of Bernini and his school which met him in every street and square, not one in five hundred being really good. He wonders how this mongrel and tortured taste can have dared to obtrude, as it continually does, into the presence of antique remains such as those which filled him with reverence for classical Rome. His admiration of the Pantheon of Agrippa brings down his merited censure on the Papal spoliations which it has suffered and the Catholic symbols which strangely misfit it. A chapter is devoted to Raphael's Transfiguration, the reverential description and critique of which wondrous master-work shew the writer to be no mean authority in art. Another chapter treats of “Theology in Raphael's hands.” In the official theology depicted by him, there are the fewest traces of his masterly genius. It is not the Church that suggests subjects of high art to him. His *School of Athens* compared with his *Theology* shews art free, genuine and inspired in the former, while cold, official and formal, though splendid and imposing, in the latter. The soul of the Renaissance inspired the one subject; the authority of the Church dictated the other. Thus our author makes good his position in the Vatican and the Sistine Chapel. Raphael the artist was not Raphael the Catholic. Theology in Raphael's hands also shews how far the doctrines of the infallible and immutable Church fell short in 1508 of the Ultramontanism of the 19th century. The Immaculate Conception is not only not hinted, it is precluded in Raphael's compositions. “Mary is a worshiper, not worshiped.”

We must pass by the graphic description of the grand ceremonial in conferring the hat on a new Cardinal, the pompous feast of St. Peter, the hideous *Bambino* riding out in his coach and working miracles on the sick, the forcible preaching of the Franciscan monk in the Coliseum, and many other topics, and

confine ourselves to the question of Religious Art. A chapter is devoted to the consideration of the requirements of Art and those of Worship, which are shewn to be often irreconcilable :

“ The Catholic worship and art have opposite interests; their conditions of existence and of success exclude one another. What is indispensable to the one, is often hurtful, sometimes fatal, to the other.”—P. 96.

Perpetual repetition has made common, till it has vulgarized, even the great scriptural scene of the Crucifixion, and still more those of the Annunciation and the Virgin and child :

“ There is a subject peculiarly simple and graceful, naturally interesting, and which would have employed many an artist’s skill even if it never had been made sacred; for human nature presents nothing more attractive;—it is, a young woman with a child in her arms. In the modest beauty of the young mother, happy yet anxious, tender and religiously grateful;—in those first holy joys of maternity, in the charming harmony and contrast of the grace of the young girl now become wife and mother with the different grace of the child;—in this simple subject there is great richness of natural emotion, which is made still deeper and sweeter by Christian sentiment. But the Church has used and abused it in all manner of ways, laboriously varying this uniform theme by the introduction of certain attributes or saints. It is a wearisome labour to look through the enormous volume in which Mrs. Jameson has treated of the *Legends of the Madonna*, and where this fine subject, everlastingly reproduced from the great masters, in more than two hundred plates, fatigues the mind and revolts the eye. There are fifty-two Madonnas, or Holy Families, in existence ascribed to Raphael, two or three of which are probably by his pupils. In the magnificent gallery of the princes Borghese, the Virgin is in more than the proportion of one to every eleven pictures. In that of the Barberini palace, fourteen pictures out of thirty are of Mary. These astounding numbers, it is very certain, are much below the proportion of Madonnas among Church pictures now-a-days ordered, since the proclamation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception.

“ Is this protecting or inspiring Art? Is it not rather smothering it under intolerable monotony? The public collections too are filled with Madonnas not fit to be looked at; and even Raphael himself, notwithstanding the great aptitude of his genius for subjects of this kind, could not avoid a certain insipidity of expression in many of his Virgins. From this uniformity has resulted the necessity of varying a worn-out theme by a thousand childish, and sometimes indecorous, expedients. Why do we hear of the Virgin and Bag, the Virgin and Rabbit, the Virgin and Cat, *L’Impannata*, and so many others? How comes it that Leonardo da Vinci, in a wondrous picture, has represented the Mother of Christ as seated on the knees of her aged mother, Saint Anne, and bending towards her Son to prevent his getting on the back of the symbolical lamb with which he is playing? The idea becoming lost in the constantly repeated symbols, the latter are materialized to such a degree that an Italian painter, having, in a large composition, represented the Holy Spirit under the form of a white dove, has so far forgotten all propriety as to draw a cat, in the corner of the picture, watching to devour the bird!”—Pp. 98—100.

If scriptural subjects are thus debased, those of Church tradition are often pitifully poor, ridiculous or impossible in themselves. The martyrdoms are hideous as works of art and brutalizing to the national character. Is not our author justified in tracing in a great degree to this source the Italian recklessness of bloodshed? What a description of the Church of *San Stefano Rotondo*!

"In itself considered, this circular building, which there is reason to suppose was erected in 467, is extremely interesting. Thirty-six columns, of marble or granite, of different orders of architecture, borrowed from monuments of antiquity, surround an inner circle of only twenty columns. The whole is encompassed by a wall divided into compartments which correspond with the intercolumniations, and each of which contains two scenes of martyrdom, if not more. The consequence is, that on all sides you see nothing but tortures the most barbarous, the most refined, the most hideous, represented with a nakedness of detail quite insupportable. When the eye, revolting at the sight of one torture, turns away, it is only to alight upon another which perhaps the most cruel imagination could not have conjured up. In fact, the most recondite study of horrors has been necessary to people this whole church with executioners; and if you have the misfortune to cast your eyes upon two or three of those bloody frescoes of Tempesta or Pomarancio, you leave this Christian temple with regret that you ever set foot in it. Is it not prostituting the arts, to sully them by these frightful representations?

"Let it not be replied: This is of little importance; Art is admirable, whatever be the object represented. I deny it. Besides, we are not now concerned with those Dutch pieces in which the interior of a citizen's house, a kitchen or a stable, is painted with surprising accuracy. What we are now concerned with is Christian art; such art as the Church orders and makes use of. I reprobate and denounce its pencil, when made an instrument of torture. I could not see without indignation, in a Jesuit church, a very large flesh-coloured crucifix, in which the depraved imagination of the artist had taken delight in colouring all the wounds deeply with blood, and making it trickle all over the body from the stripes of the scourging, while the shoulder is reddened by the burden of the cross, and the knees fearfully grazed by the repeated falls of the sufferer, till nothing but one bleeding mass is presented to view, a mere object of disgust or of horror. To what purpose are these low and savage representations? To what purpose these unwholesome terrors? They can only serve to subjugate by horror or fright those whose senses they distress. And this is a real outrage against humanity—a disgrace to art.

"It must be acknowledged that to visit the sanctuaries of Catholic Christianity and study the wonders of art with which they are enriched, is, at the same time, to go through a complete course of study of the executioner's trade, to grow learned in all imaginable kinds of torture, and familiarize oneself with all possible, and perhaps some impossible, inflictions."—Pp. 102—104.

"Can any one suppose that the imaginations of children, vividly impressed with these fearful and barbarous scenes, and finding them regularly before their eyes day by day, can avoid receiving hurtful

impressions? Does any one believe that these impressions, constantly repeated, and prolonged during the whole continuance of the services, in the midst of the solemnity of divine worship and in the dim light of the churches, are void of influence in the developement of the national character and morals? What an unhealthy education, to connect the religion of him who was meek and lowly of heart, with these dark pictures which make the flesh creep and harden the soul! What a detestable apprenticeship, that instead of calming and softening the violent passions of the Southern nations, can only serve to excite them! These are not lessons of fortitude; rather they are,—through the constant practice of contemplating those inhuman horrors from infancy upwards,—lessons of vengeance and cruelty, encouraging (as has been said) *that thirst of cruel natures for scenes of torture, which to satisfy in the churches would be too abominable*. At least they keep up an indifference to the sight of barbarous scenes. Calling to mind the images on which Italian or Spanish piety is fed, one may almost conceive the atrocious ferocity of many sincerely fervent inquisitors; one may almost conceive how Benvenuto Cellini could relate in his own *Memoirs* that, after having stabbed his rival, in ambush, he immediately ran into a church and gave thanks to God for his success and impunity in that assassination.”—Pp. 106, 107.

In connection with the respective claims of Art and Worship, M. Coquerel's good taste and clear discrimination shew him how Catholic Rome has confounded the Church with the picture gallery. The Sistine Chapel should have been called a Gallery of Art, and used as such; and then the naked figures in Michel Angelo's incomparable frescoes need not have been draped and draped again by *Bracchettone* and *Pozzi*. Nor would the *Last Judgment* in that case have been subjected to a constantly repeated process of smoking by incense and wax-lights, which will assuredly, in a given time, completely ruin it. Nor would gaudy church draperies and decorations *kill* the subdued colouring of old paintings and frescoes; nor candles, chandeliers and crosses be so placed that a connoisseur should be chargeable with having mistaken one of the executioners for St. John in the *Descent from the Cross*.

But the Catholic worship is yet more inconsistent with taste for art, and the only consolation is, as our author suggests, that high art discreetly keeps at a distance :

“ Still it is fortunate if the honours decreed by the Church to a work of art are limited to incense and tapers, great or small. Let a painting have the misfortune to be recognized as able to work miracles (a frequent case), and from that time it is exposed to more fatal glorification. Should the people be given to understand that prayers uttered before a certain picture have cured a sick person; should the sovereign acknowledge that prayers recited before another picture have frustrated an *emeute*, or enabled Austrian soldiers to put down Italians who desired to be their own masters at home;—from that moment the figure is ‘crowned.’ In other words, they bore holes in the canvas above the head of the saint, or the crucifix, or the Virgin and child; and in these

holes, O barbarism! they fix a crown of very bright gold, loaded with rubies, emeralds and diamonds of thousand facets. As soon as this actual and dazzling crown is nailed on the middle of the canvas, it is easy to imagine what becomes of the perspective, the light and shade, and even the colours of the painting; everything of the kind is falsified or becomes invisible, and thus a *chef d'œuvre* is annihilated! A *chef d'œuvre*, do we say? Perhaps we are wrong there; at least, up to the present time, we have not met with a single picture of high value that has been damaged by this pious vandalism. The very fine pictures never work miracles; they do not expose themselves to the disastrous consequences which would result; and if they have the power of working miracles, they take good care not to use it. We are bound to thank them, and perhaps also their owners, for exercising so wise a discretion."—Pp. 115, 116.

Perhaps the most interesting chapter in the volume, in a religious point of view, is that on the *Christian Antiquities in Rome*. "Between Pagan Rome still standing amid its ruins, and Papal Rome tottering amid the foreign supports which prop its decline, history has preserved the memory of a Christian Rome in which the Popes were but pastors and martyrs, namely, the Rome of the Catacombs and of the primitive Church." The gradual origin of Catholicism out of simple Christianity amid the habits, monuments and traditions of such a civilization as that of heathen Rome, is traced as the natural and inevitable course of things. The origin of Christian Art is admirably described in the following passage, its *negations* (so truly reverential in contrast with Roman Catholic art) being especially worthy of the pious Protestant's notice:

"Christianity, being introduced into the Roman world by converted Jews, shewed itself, at first, by no means favourable to the arts. The most ancient grave-stones bear no sculptured images, but only inscriptions, which are often very touching; the Christian idea of life and peace after death continually recurs. Christ is often indicated by the first two letters of the word in Greek, XP, or again by the first and last letters of the alphabet, Alpha and Omega, Α, Ω. (Apocalypse i. 8, 11; xxi. 6; xxii. 13.) Palms next appear on the tombs, as the insignia of the Christian's, and especially the martyr's, victory. (Apoc. vii. 9.) The dove carrying the olive-branch is there, as the emblem of salvation. The fish stands for the Christian, according to the saying of Jesus to Peter and Andrew: 'I will make you fishers of men.' At a later time, the same sign came to bear allusion to the names, *Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour*; the initial letters of which words spell the Greek word for *fish*. The anchor is a less common, but very intelligible, emblem. Jesus Christ had said: 'I am the true vine;' and it is well known how he developed this allegory (John xv. 1—7). It was the more often sculptured on their tombs by the Christians, as the Pagans took no offence at it, thinking they saw in it a remnant of the worship of Bacchus. At a later time, *genii* or sprites, that is to say naked children (often with wings), were represented as busy in all the labours of the vintage. The circular aisle, supported by two rows of columns, which

surrounds the church of St. Constance (built by Constantine), is covered with extremely curious Christian mosaics, in which this subject is repeated in every possible aspect. Soon Jesus appears under the type of the Lamb. Often the apostles are represented in the same way; and this has been imitated in most of the mosaics which ornament the tribunes, or apses, of churches. On a Roman sarcophagus there is a bas-relief representing the baptism of Jesus Christ, but without a human figure in it. The Saviour is a lamb, surrounded by the waves of a river badly drawn. John the Baptist also is a lamb, whose right fore-paw is laid upon the head of the first, as he kneels before him, while the dove breathes on him the divine spirit, which is represented by lines or rays proceeding from its beak."—Pp. 128—130.

"But if Christian art, in its beginning, accepted without much scruple the data of mythological art, it is not less curious when studied in its negations. We necessarily inherit the past; but we do not anticipate the future. Accordingly, the orthodoxy of subsequent tradition is unknown to the monuments of the Catacombs and to the works of the earliest centuries. In this aspect, these silent witnesses of the faith of the fourth century are very curious and very instructive. Besides the good shepherd and Christ teaching, the gospel scenes continually repeated here are such as the following: The changing of water into wine, the multiplication of the loaves, the cure of blind or sick people, the raising of the dead, especially of Lazarus; sometimes the adoration of the Magi, or the entry into Jerusalem; that is to say, a collection of subjects in which Jesus gives life, food or healing to those who believe on him; the foreign nations (represented by the Magi), or the Jews, and especially Jerusalem, are seen receiving from him these life-inspiring gifts. The scenes which are never represented until the eighth century are those of the Passion and Death of Jesus Christ, and especially that of the Crucifixion. The reason of this has been sought for. Some say, it is because the catechumens were not allowed to see such representations before their reception as members of the Church; others say it was to avoid alarming, by such sad pictures, the Christians who were exposed to persecution. These reasons seem to us frivolous; the second still more so than the first. The real truth is, that minds which had been trained by the ancient taste could not take pleasure in scenes of horror, and always wished that suffering itself should be presented under a calm and noble exterior; the cross was enough for them, without the image of the crucified, which it would have given them pain to see represented. But there is more to be said on this subject. Whereas the modern Church has paid her chief adoration to the body nailed upon the cross, the Church of the first centuries preferred contemplating Jesus as living. At first, and for a long time, she looked for his second coming; then she found her chief delight in representing him as teaching his disciples, feeding and healing souls, or bringing back the lost sheep. They did not disown Christ crucified; but they thought much more of living by his life on earth and his life in heaven, than of contemplating the horrors of his death or the griefs which encompassed his burial. When they began to treat these dreadful subjects, it was at first with extreme reserve. On a sarcophagus at Rome there is the figure of the Cross, at the foot of which are seated two Roman soldiers, the one asleep leaning on his shield, the other watching, with eyes raised towards the cross in devout

emotion. The monogram XP above it is surrounded with a crown of laurel which the dove is pecking. In these emblems there is a mysterious import, vague but more concentrated, deeper and more touching than in all the Catholic effigies. This mode of treating the subject has been repeated elsewhere.”—Pp. 132—135.

The chapter on *Protestantism at Rome* shews us (what we are little apt to suspect) that the leaven of the Reformation was as active in Italy as in any other country, and that Protestantism, having gained considerable success at first, “was only subdued by extermination.”

The remaining two letters are from Pisa, “the tomb of the Middle Ages, the funeral city where Catholic Art sleeps, with its formal beauty and its depth of expression.” The *Campo Santo* is thus vividly described :

“Everybody knows, at least from books and engravings, this *Campo Santo*, the soil of which is said to have been brought from Jerusalem by Pisan sailors. This sacred ground is surrounded by arcades in open-work of the purest elegance of design and of fairy lightness. Behind these arcades is a range of vast covered galleries, in which remains of sculpture have been collected together and funeral monuments set up; the long high walls have been covered with paintings (now half effaced by time), in which the middle ages live again complete. There they are, with manners strange, barbarous and poetical, shameless and devout by turns; their knights and noble ladies re-appearing in the dress of the times down to its minutest details; their monks, with all that profusion of devilries and miracles which the age cherished; their cruel theology, in which Jesus Christ is an angry judge; Satan a brasier in human shape, red-hot and of gigantic size; the demons unclean, hideous and absurd-looking executioners. These are immense compositions including hundreds of figures, where the most incongruous scenes are heaped up in close contact, without any regard to proportion, or even, in many cases, to perspective. Some invite real interest as works of art; others are below mediocrity, even for their time; many are become almost invisible; and lastly, some have been cut away at hazard to make room for the monument of some local celebrity or great lord, some remnant of the Pisan nobility. As in a great epic poem, so here, we have an entire age; but without its being evoked by the poet's imagination, or laboriously restored by the researches and conjectures of the antiquary. It is an entire age, or ages rather; the middle ages painted by themselves. Passing, never to return, along the high walls of the *Campo Santo*, they have left their shadow, their living image, taken on the spot by the powerful light of art.

“There let us study this art itself, and the religion to which it gave expression.

“The general effect produced by this vast gallery of Death, is a combination of the sad and the monstrous. You are oppressed with a feeling of huge size and restless multiplicity, of efforts without result and movement to no purpose. Human life, as conceived by the Catholicism of the middle ages, has in it nothing collective. The artists of the Pisan cemetery are destitute of the very idea now extolled among us under the name of *humanity*; the idea of reciprocal relations, the idea of pro-

gress, of general developement in which all should take part, and of future amelioration which all ought to hasten. With them it is every one for himself in this world, whether in joy or sorrow; the hermit first in the desert, then in heaven; the voluntary now amid his pleasures, then in hell; responsibility reduced to a hard and dismal law, the law of penitence and self-torture; man a sinner, destined to suffer, and only appeasing his wrathful God, only avoiding an eternal hell, by making for himself a provisional hell in the present world. This terrible popular theology has no more to do with love than with progress. In it, God is merciless; Jesus Christ is a judge not unmoved, but angry; and the difference between angels and demons is only that which exists between the constable who arrests the criminal and the executioner who flogs or tortures him.

“If God is charity; if Christianity is love; if moral holiness is its end, and pardon through Christ the means; this is quite a different religion from that of the *Campo Santo*, which is much more like Judaism, except indeed in the added complication and terrors of an unfeeling dogmatic creed.”—Pp. 159—162.

We commend to artists the criticism on Orcagna and the comparison drawn between his *Last Judgment* and that of Michel Angelo. The man who writes thus discriminately is intitled to hold a strong opinion on those questions of art in relation to religion which are debated between Catholic and Protestant. He says it is in Tuscany that we must seek whatever the Catholic school possesses of a serious and elevated character:

“Elsewhere we sometimes meet with fine heads, instinct with a lively faith. But I have found this sentiment habitual, and expressed in all its beauty and power, among the great Florentine artists alone, and especially among the very earliest. The pre-raphaelites in England are certainly wrong in the court of art and taste, but in that of history and criticism they are right, in looking for Catholic art prior to Sanzio; for Perugini and Fra Bartolomco, the masters of Raphael, are in fact, as religious painters, the latest serious representatives of Catholicism.

“Let us frankly render justice to whatever of Christian sentiment inspires their works. The peasant of Vespiagnano and the monk of St. Mark’s have touched me more than any others, more even than Orcagna. Giotto is more free and evangelical; Angelico more catholic and monastic; but both of them brighten their sacred pictures with a true reflection of Christian light.”—Pp. 172, 173.

Giotto and Angelico thus divide with Orcagna our author’s chief admiration as Christian artists. His description of the *Noli me tangere* by the first, is itself a picture. The fresco is Christian, not Catholic; scriptural, not traditional or ecclesiastical. Of Leonardo da Vinci,—whose head of the Christ in the *Last Supper* he prefers to every other representation of the Saviour,—he says,

“Leonardo was near enough to the Catholic school to have retained something of the Christian element which it still included, and which the light of the Renaissance enabled him to separate from much of its alloy. In another point of view, his work has nothing Catholic about

it, being inspired purely by the gospel; and with him, as with Giotto, but in a far higher degree, this is the origin and explanation of the success achieved.”—P. 194.

The contents of the book before us are not exhausted with the letters from Naples, from Rome and from Pisa; but we must run hastily over the rest. *A Glance at Italian Architecture* gives occasion to our traveller to say that if the Catholic Church has an architecture of her own, it is to be found anywhere in Christendom rather than in Italy. What is called Catholic architecture “is only found in Germany, in Belgium, in England and in France; that is, in the Northern countries, and in a great measure in those countries which have since become Protestant. So untrue is the assertion that the Church of Rome and the Fine Arts can make common cause, or that Catholicism has a right to the name of *universal*!” There is no Gothic church architecture in Italy south of Milan; all is triangular pediment and semicircular arch. The Italians did not even know how to add a steeple to a church, and so built their bell-towers separate.

The characteristic middle-age architecture of Italy is to be found, in fact, not in the religious, but the civic buildings.

This “glance” includes a very clear description of the Roman Basilica, and of the derivation of the Italian churches in some instances from this source and in others from the Roman temple. On the church architecture suited to Protestant worship, the author has these judicious suggestions:

“I know the reply may be made to me, by defying us, free Christians who wear the yoke of no human incorporation, to create the universal and distinctive type of Christian art. That type will never exist, and for this reason: the Christian is native neither of the south nor of the north; he can pray in peace amid the long lines of a Grecian temple, or send up his prayer to God under the lofty arch and bold pinnacles of a Gothic cathedral. Christianity has no need of any factitious or partial unity; that of the human race is enough for her. She sympathizes with art, inspires it, is edified by it, so long as she finds it serious and pure, large and free. But she protests, in most of the churches of Italy, against that evil taste for strained and costly ornaments, that sumptuous display of luxury and pomp, in which art is suffocated under the weight of gold. But I will not recur to this abuse, against which taste and piety alike murmur; as I have had too many occasions in these letters to rise up in protest against the exorbitant profusion of church ornament; and I content myself with referring to what I have said before, and to the cutting censure of Petronius on the sumptuous style of houses and temples, as the usual scourge of periods of decline.

“As for Protestantism, it has almost everywhere inherited churches which had become useless when Catholicism had quitted them. The problem of the creation of the type of architecture most suitable to our worship has therefore not yet been sufficiently studied. It will be requisite to remember, in working it out, the laws of acoustics which are as yet very ill understood; for Protestants cannot forget this principle of the most glorious preacher of the gospel: that *Faith comes by hearing*

(Rom. x. 17). We think the solution of the problem will be much less likely to be found, if we imitate the cruciform churches of modern Catholics, than if we recur to one or other of the types of the first Christian churches in Italy; either the Rotundo of the Pantheon, or the true Basilica, which latter was a parallelogram surrounded by a gallery carried on pillars half the height of the building. The church of Charenton, built by our celebrated co-religionist *de Brosse*, was constructed on this latter plan. It is true that we are thus reverting to Pagan constructions; but the basilicas were mere places of assembly, not of religious worship; the rotundo lighted from above has been borrowed from the ancient hot-bath; all the temples of the ancients were of small dimensions and scarcely lighted; often the priests alone entered them, and in many there was no opening but the door. Public worship, social acts of homage did not exist, or took place only in the open air and under political circumstances of great moment. Moreover, the Christians of the first centuries have consecrated this kind of buildings by their prayers and martyrdoms; and all that Catholicism has added to them has been its chapels, copied from the pagan *ædiculæ*, and the transept which makes one part of the church and the worshipers invisible to the rest.

“What we want is, a large and compact assembly, where all can see and hear, and which the preacher can take in at a glance. Preaching is, in a Catholic cathedral, a mere accessory of the ceremonial; from many parts the pulpit is ill seen; you hear ill; you may be lost in the distance or in some recess of the building; and the assembly thus parcelled out has not the unity of our religious services, in which all present, preacher and hearers, moved by the same faith, raise their souls to God with the same feeling and jointly *worship Him in spirit and in truth*.

“The time is past when St. Laurence the deacon, being summoned to give up the treasures of the Christian church to the prefect of Rome, assembled all the orphans, the aged and the sick whom she assisted, and presented them to the tyrant as the only wealth possessed by their community. It is only our Protestant churches that can now say as much. Their architecture ought to be simple and unencumbered; it is wrong that it should have been so often neglected; but we must remember that the finest ornament of our churches will always be a thoughtful and fervent crowd of free worshipers.”—Pp. 214—217.

Having given the author’s “Conclusion” in the opening of our remarks, we have only now to notice (what is indeed very noticeable) his Appendix on the Iconography of the Immaculate Conception, that is, on the attempts of bishops and artists to devise the means of representing in sculpture or painting the doctrine that Mary was conceived without sin! Truly our author may say, the church prescribes impossible and ridiculous conditions. “To paint a dogma! and such a dogma!” The attempts detailed in this Appendix, and still more the clerical instructions given on the subject (not without serious diversity between high authorities), would be amusing and grotesque in the extreme, if to the thoughtful Protestant they were not rather saddening and degrading. In Catholic France this Appendix must be more likely to awaken real thought than in England,

where we only hear the distant sound of these drivelling absurdities of modern Catholicism. The Immaculate Conception is a doctrine, after all, not of Italian, not of Roman, not of Papal growth, but Spanish. But the effect on Art is our author's topic ; and he thus concludes his Appendix on the Iconography of the Immaculate Conception :

“This is throwing Art back into infancy ; but none can return to that first innocent and charming infancy to which the future belonged, whose every step was new progress, whose every endeavour a conquest. Factitious infancy is but senility and decrepitude ; it is that servile puerility which proceeds from exhaustion and survives thought and will, rendering us the slaves even of those to whom we once were superior.”—Pp. 266, 267.

The extracts we have made from this remarkable book will have satisfied our readers that M. Coquerel is more fortunate in his translators than is commonly the fate of foreign writers. With his exact knowledge of our language, he would have been sorely tried had his work been “done into English” by some translators not unfrequently before the public, and whom some critics, too, have praised. It is not often that the work of a French author comes before the public of this country with the advantages which have attended the translation of these Letters. The experience and literary skill of one of the translators, and the thorough knowledge of French idiom acquired in a long residence in Paris by the other, might have ensured a good work ; and they have had, we understand, the further satisfaction of placing the proof-sheets before M. Coquerel himself as they proceeded. The English book may in fact be regarded as an improved and enlarged edition of the original work.

SONNET.

WHERE may I meet thee, Truth, fair goddess born ?
 Within the Orient's rosy tinted halls,
 In some bright land, where rapture never palls
 The sense ? My weary heart with woe is worn,
 My bleeding feet with cruel thorns are torn,
 A pitchy darkness round my pathway falls ;
 No loving voice, in gentle accent, calls
 Me through the night. I am the butt of scorn.
 Yet I did see thy garments sweep the sky,
 When thou didst tread the glowing clouds afar :
 Most mighty was thy form, thy bearing high,
 Upon thy forehead glowed the morning star.
 Though 'neath thy feet storm-clouds and darkness lie,
 I dare come to thee e'en through nature's war.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. CHARLES WELLBELOVED.*

No intelligent traveller visits York without taking a walk on its ancient walls, the singularly interesting remains of the ramparts which in the earlier periods of English history made it a formidable stronghold. The walk is now easily made on the walls that lie on the south of the Ouse, and also on that northern portion of them that stretches from Fishergate postern, near the river, to Walmgate Bar, with its Barbican, one of the very few remaining specimens of that ancient mode of fortifying a city gate. To the pedestrian who combines with a love of pure air and beautiful scenery and magnificent architecture a moderate acquaintance with English history and its localities, a more interesting walk is nowhere to be found. He has a succession of views of the glorious Minster and the numerous churches of the city,—of the grounds of the Philosophical Society, studded with objects of surpassing interest to the antiquary,—of the windings of two rivers,—of Severus's Hill, of Clifford's Tower, and, in the distance, looks towards the site of the decisive battle-fields of Stamford Bridge and Marston Moor. For the ease with which this promenade is now enjoyed, citizens and travellers are largely indebted to the thoughtfulness and quiet energy of Mr. Wellbeloved. When he settled in York, the walls, after nearly a century of neglect, were falling into decay and ruin. As with the exquisite remains of St. Mary's Abbey, so with the city ramparts, the stone work was being frequently loosened and pilfered for the most insignificant purposes. There was a total apathy in the public mind in respect to the preservation and restoration of the walls and other antiquities of the city. Less than thirty years ago, a lengthened walk on the walls was impracticable to ladies, and could only be enjoyed by any one at the risk of a sprained ankle. Regrets and reproaches were now and then spoken and printed, but nothing was done to stay the mischief. Mr. Wellbeloved had united himself with a few persons anxious to walk in "the old ways" of York and its vicinity in the formation of a society called the "Foot-path Association."† He made the happy proposal, which was at once

* Continued from Vol. XIV. p. 696.

† Mr. Wellbeloved, like Timothy Bennet (the patriotic shoemaker of Hampton Wick, who vindicated the public right of way through Bushy Park), was unwilling to leave the world as to its foot-paths worse than he found it. There are few neighbourhoods in which such societies as the "Foot-path Association" of York may not be useful. It was in consequence of the patriotic interest which his father felt in the preservation of public ways, that the late Mr. Robt. Scott (then Robert Wellbeloved) composed and published his treatise on the Law of Highways. In Gilbert Wakefield's autobiography, first published in 1792, is a good account of two defenders of old ways, of whom Bennet was one. The other was Mr. John Lewis, of Richmond, who vindicated the right of way through the Park there. Mr. Wellbeloved might derive some portion of his own public spirit in the matter of foot-paths from Gilbert Wakefield's narrative. The walks rescued from the royal grasp would be familiar to him in his youthful days.

adopted, that the walk on the walls should be considered as a common foot-path, and thus be included within the conservation and provident operation of the society. The organized action thus secured proved effectual. The city corporation, the natural conservators of the walls, shamed at last out of their long neglect, voted £100 towards the restoration ; an appeal was made to the public for help ; subscriptions flowed in, and the work was done. It may be confidently predicted that the citizens of York will not again allow their matchless ramparts to fall into disuse, at least as a public promenade.

Another local society which Mr. Wellbeloved assisted to found, and which for thirty years continued to enjoy the benefits of his counsel and liberal aid, was the York Institute of Popular Science and Literature. This society, established in 1827, has achieved an amount of success and public serviceableness surpassing that of most of our provincial Mechanics' Institutions, numbering at the present time 425 members, of whom 369 belong to the class for which such educational institutions are especially designed. Evening classes for instruction in useful knowledge, a library, a reading-room well supplied with newspapers and periodicals, and popular lectures on science, history and literature, have been the agencies by which the society has aimed to instruct and refine the people. Elected from the beginning its Vice-President, Mr. Wellbeloved was not the man to accept the honour without an ample payment of faithful duty. From 1827 to 1844 (we are informed by a member of the society), he presided over half the numerous committee meetings ; and another states that he delivered several addresses, and devoted many an evening to lectures delivered to a small circle of hearers, in the humble room which the Institute then occupied. Only those who remember the time when institutions for popularizing knowledge were frowned upon by the higher classes of society in Church and State, can estimate the service rendered by Mr. Wellbeloved and his coadjutors, whose zeal was not checked by obloquy, nor chilled by the long-delayed success of their efforts. "His success" (it has been remarked by one who enjoyed many opportunities of observing it) "in the conduct of public business arose from his methodical habits, his gentlemanly bearing, and his ready deference to others in all matters in which conviction and principle did not require him to adhere to his own opinions." When, by the death of Sir George Cayley, the President's chair became vacant, the wish was expressed that Mr. Wellbeloved should be his successor, but the infirmities of age then precluded his undertaking the duties of the office.*

* At a general meeting of the Institute, recently held to inaugurate the current session, the Rev. Canon Hey, the successor of Sir Geo. Cayley, bore a very honourable testimony to Mr. Wellbeloved's services, describing him as "a man of high ability and profound learning," and as "the oldest and firmest friend of

The benevolence which induced Mr. Wellbeloved to devote much of his valuable time to the protection of the insane, also attracted him to the Wilberforce School for the Blind. With the views and plans of its able superintendent, the Rev. Wm. Taylor, he was able heartily to concur. But he did not satisfy himself with a mere routine discharge of official duties in connection with the charity, but by friendly conversation and other modes of shewing his sympathy won the confidence and affection of the poor blind children. At one of the anniversaries of the school, avoiding all public display, he placed himself behind a door through which the pupils would pass, and gave a shilling to each as he went out. It is said that long after he had ceased to visit the school, the elder pupils would inquire affectionately about him, and regret that they no longer heard his pleasant voice and the kind and playful words which he used to address to them. He was a director for many years of the York Dispensary ; and, in short, it may be said that he actively supported nearly every institution in the city, based on a catholic foundation, which aimed to meliorate the condition or lighten the sufferings of his fellow-creatures.

By natural constitution and by habit, Mr. Wellbeloved was indisposed to controversy. He was a lover both of peace and truth. He sought for truth with an earnest and most impartial mind, not in the warfare of parties nor the angry polemics of controversial writers, but in the quiet study of holy writ and of the best writers on theology of every church. But he did not allow his love of peace and his habitually calm pursuit of truth to ensnare him into an unworthy silence when conscience and duty bade him speak in correction of misrepresentation and in defence of the simplicity of the gospel. The circumstances which compelled Mr. Wellbeloved to enter into religious controversy were these. About the year 1821, he made the acquaintance (through the introduction of the Rev. B. Evans, of Stockton) of Captain Thomas Thrush, a man of intelligence and piety, of remarkable simplicity of mind and integrity of character. Settled late in life, after quitting the naval service, at Filiskirk, in the North-riding of Yorkshire, he devoted his leisure to theological study, and such was his ardour that he set himself, at sixty years of age, the task of learning Greek, that he might read the New Testament in its original. Finding himself precluded by the opinions he had deliberately adopted from joining in the Trinitarian worship of his neighbours, he printed and circulated amongst them a Letter explanatory of Unitarian opinions. The clergyman then presiding over the archdeaconry of Cleveland was the Rev. Francis Wrangham, a man devoted to literature and the collection

the Institute." In the Annual Report, the Committee ascribe the prosperity of the society in great measure to Mr. Wellbeloved's support, counsel and generous aid.

of books, and possessing considerable repute as an elegant scholar. His Charge delivered to the clergy of his archdeaconry in July, 1821, contained some highly rhetorical and harsh allusions to Captain Thrush's opinions and the circulation he had given to them in a neighbouring parish, and also an intimation that they should receive further animadversions in a future Charge. From the fulfilment of this promise he could not, if he wished it, recede, as Captain Thrush addressed to him a Letter of Remonstrance, in which Unitarianism was discussed and defended. After a reply from a Vicar-Choral of York and a rejoinder from the Captain, the Archdeacon published his second Charge, the burthen of which was a tirade against Unitarians and their doctrines, which but too well illustrated his own description of controversial literature as consisting mainly of "sarcasms and invectives calculated to irritate and widen the wound which it fruitlessly affects to heal." The Charge, slender in bulk as in material, was on publication swollen to triple its size by an appendix and notes, containing some contemptuous abuse of "Socinianism" as a "school of sciolism and schism" (the favourite clerical tone when speaking of Unitarianism), and many discursive remarks, got up with some little parade of learning, on topics connected with the great controversy before him. It was not expedient that, in opposition to an adversary of the Archdeacon's position and repute, Captain Thrush should, unaided, continue the contest. To Mr. Wellbeloved the task was irksome, and it gave him sincere pain to rebuke, as the circumstances required that he should do, one from whom he had more than once received personal kindness and hospitality.* But it *was* a duty—and he undertook it, and, notwithstanding a heavy domestic bereavement, fulfilled it well. In the spring of 1823, appeared his "Three Letters addressed to the Ven. and Rev. Francis Wrangham, M.A., in reply to his Remarks on Unitarianism and Unitarians," &c. They received at once a degree of attention which surprised and gratified their author, who in his modesty had anticipated for them the fate of encumbering the booksellers' shelves for a month or two, and then descending into the common tomb of unbought books, the chandler's shop. Whatever subject he selected from the multifarious topics so discursively and superficially handled by his opponent, his exact knowledge of facts, candid statements and judicious arguments, combined to give value and interest to his Letters. On many topics, such as the Unitarianism of Locke, Newton and Watts, the right of Unitarians to the Christian name, the principles of biblical criticism adopted by Unitarians, the merits and faults of the Improved Version, the opinions of Dr. Priestley and Mr. Belsham, the arguments for the Trinity, and the testi-

* Mr. Wellbeloved sometimes had visited the beautiful bay of Filey, on the coast of Yorkshire, which adjoins Hunmanby, the parish of which the Archdeacon was rector.

mony of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, the Three Letters present a mass of valuable and reliable statements, admirable for pertinence and brevity. For his rhetorical declamation and unfounded sarcasm, his repetition of the confuted calumnies of Horsley and Magee, and his numerous errors, the Archdeacon received the chastisement he deserved. But the personal part of the Three Letters is not considerable, and there are few pages which may not prove interesting and instructive to the reader who knows and cares little about the individual to whom they were addressed. The Archdeacon had in the notes to his second Charge disclaimed the purpose of continuing the controversy; but on second thoughts he returned to the contest in the notes to his third Charge, delivered August, 1823. That the rebukes administered by his opponent were unpalatable to Mr. Wrangham, surprised no one. His attempt to retort the charges of personality and want of courtesy was attended with little success. In no single instance was he able to convict his opponent of a misstatement or an inaccuracy,—a very remarkable circumstance when we remember the number of subjects discussed, and the difficulty of treating some of them with brevity as well as accuracy. A diversion was attempted by a Yorkshire rector of the name of Oxlee, who addressed Three Letters to “Mr. C. Wellbeloved, Tutor of the Unitarian College, York,” in which he essayed to prove that separation from the Mother Church was both foolish and criminal, and to defend the metaphysics of the Athanasian Creed. Without condescending to notice his new assailant, Mr. Wellbeloved replied in 1824 to the Archdeacon in “Three Additional Letters.” In the two first Letters he demolished with crushing force his opponent’s defences, and met with equal success his new attacks; and in the remaining Letter he discussed the doctrine of the Trinity with such perspicacity and force, that it may be well regarded as a model essay in theological controversy.

Here the controversy ended. On which side the victory lay was not doubtful. Even in clerical circles it was admitted that the Archdeacon was no match, either in solid learning or sound logic, for his Nonconformist adversary. Throughout the Unitarian body there prevailed a feeling of admiration and gratitude towards the able and learned defender of their principles and their departed worthies.

In the year 1807, about a century after the establishment of the Trust by the lady of Sir John Hewley, Mr. Wellbeloved became a sub-trustee or manager of the almshouse in Tanner Row (since removed to St. Saviour-Gate), York, designed for the support of ten poor persons. For some years previously, the affairs of the charity had been strangely neglected, no new Trustees having been appointed, and in consequence the payment of an annuity from the exchequer had been discontinued for twenty-six years. Mr. Wellbeloved had also a beneficial interest in the administration

of the general Trust, being, as the minister of St. Saviour-Gate chapel, a recipient from the "Grand Trustees" of a yearly allowance from the general fund. The chapel was in the first instance built by Lady Hewley, and the minister of it had from the earliest period of the administration of the Trust, beginning with those who well knew the wishes and intentions of the foundress, been specially included among the "poor and godly ministers" whom she designed to assist.

When, under the influence of hatred of the Unitarianism of the Trustees, the orthodox Dissenters disputed in the Court of Chancery their fitness to administer the Trust, it was objected that Mr. Wellbeloved was not a "poor" godly minister. It might have been truly said in reply, that, in comparison with the heads of houses in our universities, and of the leading preachers of other religious bodies, both in and out of the Church, Mr. Wellbeloved's professional income was so small as not to take him out of the class who were the express objects of Lady Hewley's bounty; but the fact that Dr. Thomas Colton and the Rev. John Hotham, two of his three predecessors in the St. Saviour-Gate pulpit, neither of them "poor" men, had received proportionate grants from the first Trustees, was an unanswerable vindication of the grant made for about thirty years to Mr. Wellbeloved. In commenting on the objection taken by the Independent relators to the grants made to Mr. Wellbeloved by the Trustees of Lady Hewley, the Rev. J. Hunter indignantly asked, "Is this the return which Dissenters make to the laborious life of Mr. Wellbeloved, and to the honour which his writings have brought to the Dissenting name?"* The Vice-Chancellor, in pronouncing his decree against the Trustees, Dec. 23, 1833, declared that "no stipend ought to be continued to Mr. Wellbeloved, or to any person preaching the doctrines he does."

As one of the defendants in the Hewley suit, Mr. Wellbeloved had the right of appearing by counsel when the matter came to be argued in the Court of Chancery. When an appeal was made against the judgment of Vice-Chancellor Shadwell, he selected as his counsel Mr. Charles Purton Cooper, whose speech, delivered July 2, 1834, and afterwards printed more than once, was a masterly argument, containing a full and accurate historical sketch of the religious opinions and relative position of the Independents and Presbyterians. How far Mr. Wellbeloved supplied

* "Historical Defence of the Trustees," p. 68. In the appendix to this valuable pamphlet, in commenting on a pamphlet of Mr. George Hadfield's, Mr. Hunter justly observes, "We see in these remarks on Mr. Wellbeloved's income, what men of attainment have to expect when men like the writer of this pamphlet have the regulation of the incomes for the higher services in society. Mr. Wellbeloved's life has been one of great labour; and if he had received twice as much as he has received, he could not, on any fair comparison of service and reward, be thought overpaid. Besides, all who have known him have known his generous and charitable disposition."—P. 75.

materials to his counsel we do not absolutely know ; we believe, however, that Mr. Cooper was largely indebted to the varied and accurate knowledge of his friend Mr. Hunter, to whom more than any other man was owing the final triumph of justice and liberality in the passing of the Dissenters' Chapels Bill. With much dignity and his habitual disinterestedness, Mr. Wellbeloved instructed his counsel to say nothing on behalf of his personal interests in the issue of the suit. "My venerable client," he said, "is unwilling that, in a matter of such wide concern, the time of the Court should be occupied with what may seem to relate only to himself."

The mode in which the Independent Dissenters who conducted this suit used the inquisitorial powers of the Court of Chancery to extort answers from Mr. Wellbeloved and the other defendants as to their religious opinions, cannot be regarded as otherwise than inconsistent in and discreditable to men who make it a first principle to deny the prerogative of Cæsar to interfere in things pertaining to God and his worship. In the first instance, the Trustees answered all questions relating to their conduct in the administration of the charity, but gave no answers as to their individual religious opinions. Lord Henley, the Master, the Vice-Chancellor and the Chancellor, Lord Brougham, successively held that the Trustees must give in answers as to their belief. Mr. Wellbeloved complied with the demand thus enforced, and gave a statement of his creed in the words of Scripture ; but at the same time declared his judgment that in his character as a Trustee it was wholly immaterial what his particular religious opinions were ; and he put on record in his answers his deliberate conviction that "he ought not to have been compelled to answer as to the particulars of his religious belief." It will be easily understood how trying and painful to a man of Mr. Wellbeloved's sensitiveness and delicacy of conscience these Chancery interrogatories were, not because he had any difficulty as to the facts, but because he very properly doubted the right of a court of justice to extort answers as to religious opinions, and consequently the propriety of obeying an unjust and inquisitorial order. But the final result of the Hewley case, and the judgment in the House of Lords against the Trustees, were the means of paving the way for that great act of legislative justice, the Dissenters' Chapels Act. The necessity for passing such a protective statute had been made sufficiently apparent to Lord Chancellor Lyndhurst and others having official responsibility, by the remorseless proceedings of the orthodox Dissenters in England and Ireland. When the law thus threw its shield over Unitarians, and secured them the continued possession of the houses of prayer built by their forefathers, no one more rejoiced than Mr. Wellbeloved, and that feeling was a compensation for the anxieties which the Hewley suit had cost him.

When Mr. Wellbeloved entered on the evening of life, although his pupils and friends could detect no signs of declining mental powers, and his health continued though not robust, yet not materially worse than it had been for many years before, he announced his purpose of bringing to a close the relation which for so many years he had sustained to the College. How important his services had been, and how largely the institution rested upon him, was manifested by the fact that on his retirement from office as Principal and Theological Professor, the institution was necessarily removed to another locality. His retirement, at the close of the session 1839-40, from the College over which he had then presided for thirty-seven years, called forth from his pupils an expression of affectionate and grateful reverence, than which, as one of them publicly observed, "none was ever more fully deserved, and none was ever more heartily given." On June 25, 1840, there was presented to him at the annual dinner of the College Trustees, by the hands of his friends, Mr. Mark Philips and Rev. J. G. Robberds, a testimonial, to which 51 lay students and 71 divinity students had contributed with a zealous alacrity not often experienced by those who appeal to the pocket as well as the sympathy of other men. To this fact the writer of this imperfect memoir is able to speak with full knowledge, as on him devolved the pleasant duty of carrying on the correspondence which preceded the presentation at York. On the handsome piece of silver plate which formed a portion of the gift, there were inscribed these words, as truthful as they are beautiful :

VIRO·REVERENDO·CAROLO·WELLBELOVED
 COLL·MANCVN·APVD·EBORACENSES·PRÆFECTO·IBIDEM·THEOLOGIÆ·PROFESSORI
 PER·XXXVII·ANNOS·LITERARUM·SACRARUM·DISCIPLINAS
 MVLTIPLICI·DOCTRINA·SINE·PARTIVM·STVDIO·TRADENTI
 IN·DISCIPVLORVM·CONFORMANDIS·REGEN DISQVE·MORIBUS·GRAVITATEM·COMITATE·
 TEMPERANTI
 IN·OMNI·VITÆ·RATIONE·SANCTO·SIMPLICI·BENEVOLO·STRENO
 PRÆCEPTORIS·MVNVS
 EXIMIA·FIDE·RELIGIONE·DILIGENTIA·ADMINISTRATVM
 IAMIAM·DEPOSITVRO
 EX·ÆRE·CONLATO·DONVM·DEDERVNT
 PII·GRATI·VENERABVNDI
 COLL·MANCVN·ALVMNI
 VII·KAL·IVL·ANNO·MDCCXXX

In tones of deep feeling, which memory brings back to the writer as clearly as if they had been spoken but yesterday, Mr. Robberds, addressing his companions and successors in study at York on the characteristics of their Principal, said, " We think of him, and shall ever to the end of our lives think of him, with reverence for his varied learning, with admiration for his exceeding modesty, candour and impartiality, and with gratitude for the mildness, the urbanity, the kindness, which, whether as his pupils, or as his visitors and the partakers of his hospitality since we have ceased to be his pupils, we have ever experienced from

him. Especially I may be allowed, when speaking in behalf of my brother ministers, to thank him for the respect which in our instance he has always paid to the rights of the human mind, for the care with which he has always abstained from attempting to influence, to bias our inquiries, for having so constantly set before us 'the truth' as that which ought to be the object of our desires and endeavours, and for having so regularly reminded us of our responsibility to the God of truth for the manner in which we used the opportunities and means which God has given us of attaining to a knowledge of the truth."—In acknowledging the gifts, Mr. Wellbeloved spoke with a simple dignity and pathos which went to the hearts of the friends around him, as the tears of many shewed. The words spoken will not convey to those who did not hear them an adequate impression of the effect they produced; to those whose privilege it was to be present on the occasion, it is not necessary to rehearse them; for although eighteen years have passed since that day, they will not forget either the words or tones of their venerable Tutor. At the close of his address, the applause usual on such occasions was checked by a feeling perfectly *solemn* in its character. The markedly silent pause which followed was one of the most touching and delicate tributes of respect which good men could pay to a benefactor. The only person in that crowded room who did not feel that the acknowledgment made by Mr. Wellbeloved was the best possible, was the speaker himself, who, though the gentlest critic of other men's performances, sometimes, to his discomfort, practised the habit which Quintilian describes by the terms "sese calumniandi." Before that remarkable meeting broke up (to which friends had flocked from distant as well as nearer counties in England, and even from Ireland), Mr. Wellbeloved said,—"As long as I live I shall look back upon the thirty-seven years of my connection with the College with peculiar delight. Though they have been years in which I have had no little degree of labour, and of daily and hourly anxious cares,—years in which, personally, I have suffered a great deal,—yet they have been years to which, as long as I have recollection, I certainly must look back with the greatest degree of interest, as having enabled me, I hope, to be of some service to my generation, and to have forwarded, in some degree, the good cause of civil and religious liberty, and of that freedom of mind which I consider to be the most valuable of all the qualifications with which truth can be investigated."

The testimonial, of which the presentation has been described, proceeded from those only who had been students under him. We may now without any violation of delicacy mention, what has never before been publicly stated, that the sum of one thousand pounds was afterwards privately raised amongst the friends of the College, and presented to him on his retirement. It is

right that, at the fitting time, a fact like this, honourable to our religious body as well as to the individual, should be recorded.

Thus ended Mr. Wellbeloved's academic and professorial career; and his thirty-seven years of laborious and self-denying toil entitle his name to be placed among the most learned and disinterested of our Nonconformist instructors of youth. The number of his pupils may have been less than that of Frankland, —in eloquence and wide-spread popularity he may not have equalled Doddridge,—but he combined in his own person and character many of the noble qualities of both, and added to them learning not inferior to that of Jeremiah Jones, and the manners and accomplishments of Henry Grove.

In the year 1845, Mr. Wellbeloved was seriously ill, but was preserved by a gracious Providence for another term of life and duty. He had happily sufficiently recovered his strength in the summer of that year to welcome to York several of his former pupils, who assembled there to hold a social gathering proposed to be held by surviving York students every five years. It was an unexpected pleasure to many of them to attend a social meeting of the York congregation, called together that they might present to their pastor “a memorial of his work of faith and labour of love.” It consisted of a silver tea-service, both beautiful and valuable. Mr. Wellbeloved, now in the fifty-fourth year of his active ministry, had outlived all who first elected him their pastor. In addressing his flock on this pleasing occasion, he was able to declare with respect to his public services, “I can conscientiously say that your religious instruction, your spiritual and moral improvement, not your entertainment, has ever guided me in the selection of the subjects to which in the course of my preaching I have directed your attention. I have studiously avoided preaching in any sense or in any degree myself; my desire has been to preach Jesus Christ my Lord. My anxious inquiry from week to week has been, ‘How shall I best open the Scriptures to those who hear me? How shall I most powerfully excite and help them to sustain their devotional feelings? How shall I most effectually persuade them to keep themselves in the love of God and of Christ? How shall I kindle in them a warm desire after holiness and virtue, and most successfully urge them to be and to do all that the Lord their God requires of them?’ I have never sought to excite or amuse you by curious speculations, by the sallies of a lively imagination, or by a studied display of eloquence, nor have I perplexed you or endangered your Christian charity by setting before you subjects of a controversial character.”

Here it will be convenient that a description should be given of Mr. Wellbeloved as a preacher. The brief sketch that follows is an offering from the pen of one who enjoyed opportunities of hearing him, not only during his five years of student life,

but also at a subsequent period when fulfilling temporary duties in connection with York College :

“ As a preacher, Mr. Wellbeloved was simple, earnest and grave ; always introducing his discourse by a most exact and clear elucidation of the passage of scripture in which it took its rise, in order that the original import of the text might be fully understood, and not suffered to bear a meaning beyond its primitive intent. Hence the application of his subject was perfectly natural and just, and invariably its own commendation to the acceptance of his hearers. He did not fill out the words of scripture with all imaginable doctrinal or spiritual significance ; he knew too well how truth had suffered from the habit. On the great truths involved, however, and applicable to all time, no one could more solemnly and powerfully dwell. Not the most careless hearer could miss the truth intended to be enforced. The highest influence of the pulpit was there. Memory recurs to many an occasion when the great themes of Duty, Providence and Christian Immortality, not least as addressed to the tried and suffering as well as to the youthful mind, were urged with a tenderness and pathos, and often under a weight of emotion, which left no eye dry or heart unmoved. Fain would we hope for some printed memorials of solemn hours, blessed by so pure a presence, its venerable form, its living voice.”

Subsequently to 1845, Mr. Wellbeloved’s labours were lightened by the appointment of assistant ministers, first of Rev. John Wright, and afterwards of Rev. H. V. Palmer. He continued to preach until his 82nd year. His last appearance in the pulpit was in March, 1850. In the month of July, 1852, he performed the last public act of his ministry by administering the Lord’s Supper. A few months previously, his flock signalized the interesting anniversary of the completion of the sixtieth year of his ministry by presenting to him an address of affectionate congratulation. It is a rare thing amongst English Nonconformists for a minister of varied accomplishments to spend a long life in the same place,—still more rare for such a man’s personal ministry to number sixty years. It would not be easy to find a congregational document more appropriate to the occasion or more interesting than this address of the St. Saviour-Gate congregation to their venerable pastor. His reply proved that, however diminished his bodily strength might be, his mental powers were still in full vigour. Our readers may find both recorded in our pages (Vol. VIII., N.S., pp. 192—194). When prevented himself from conducting the morning religious service at St. Saviour-Gate, it was his consolation to know that the spiritual interests of his people were well provided for by his devoted and gifted son-in-law, the Rev. John Kenrick, who during several of the closing years of Mr. Wellbeloved’s life supplied his place.

Debarred by the feebleness incident to great age from con-

tinuing the active discharge of his public duties, Mr. Wellbeloved found solace in completing some portions of his Translation of the Old Testament, and amusement in antiquarian and other congenial studies. To the last, his eyesight was powerful, his memory clear, and his mental powers generally bright. His handwriting, long after he became an octogenarian, was firm and beautifully distinct. It was Mr. Wellbeloved's privilege to enjoy, more than commonly falls to the lot of those that live beyond the threescore years and ten, the soothing alleviations and the serene pleasures

" which should accompany old age,
As honour, love, obedience, troops of friends."

His conversation, when surrounded by two or three old friends, always instructive, was sometimes lively and playful. No one would better describe the events and scenes of other days, or give with greater exactness an anecdote gathered in some of his walks in the less frequented paths of literature. For some time before his decease, he had come to the wise determination to enter upon no new subject, but to devote his few remaining days to the completion of inquiries and works already in progress.

With the polish of the scholar and the gentleman, he combined an habitual reverence for truth, which kept him free from the little insincerities too frequent in society. Gentle and constitutionally timid, he could, when the occasion demanded it, manifest high moral courage. Not many men like, in defence of an endangered truth, to expose themselves to the angry notice of a popular wit. This Mr. Wellbeloved has been known to do, rebuking, at the call of religious liberty and charity, one of the most powerful and admired *lions* of English society. But gentleness and delicate regard for the feelings of those with whom he associated were the characteristics of his social bearing. He felt acutely any instance (though such things were rare) of contrary habits in others. This was the necessary consequence of his refined sensibility, and of an occasional tendency to depression of spirits.

His family affections were as tender as they were strong. Blest beyond the common lot in the domestic circle, his sensitive heart mourned, as few men mourn, when the family circle began to be contracted by the removal of the objects of his warmest love. Nine children were born to him, and he lived to see a third generation of descendants. But bereavement after bereavement spread frequent clouds of sorrow over his earthly path. His second son, John Wellbeloved, a young man described by one who knew him well as "gifted by nature with superior talents, and with a warm, benevolent and guileless heart," was cut off in the 22nd year of his age, while finishing in Germany his studies preparatory to entering on the ministry. In little more than three years after, he was called on to mourn the loss of the partner of his home, a lady

“admired, esteemed and loved for her excellent understanding, her exemplary fortitude, her cheerful piety, and her regular discharge of every social and domestic duty.” It was his unhappiness to survive the greater number of his children. His youngest daughter became the wife of the Hon. James Carter, Chief Justice of New Brunswick, but her married life was not of long continuance. Another daughter, who presided for many years over her widowed father’s household, and whose gentle disposition was most congenial to his own, too soon followed her sister. Mr. Robt. Wellbeloved, his youngest son (who after his marriage took the name of Scott), a barrister, and for a short time the representative in Parliament of the borough of Walsall, was cut off in the midst of great public and social usefulness about two years ago. One son and two daughters survive Mr. Wellbeloved; the younger being the wife of the Rev. Dr. Wreford, of Bristol; the elder, the wife of Rev. John Kenrick, of York. It was the privilege of the latter, assisted by her husband, to cheer the last years of her father’s decline by the gentle offices of filial reverence; and never were the duties of this relation more watchfully and tenderly fulfilled.

It is mentioned in one of the not few tributes of respect to Mr. Wellbeloved’s memory, as “not unworthy of note that he was attended by aged domestics, one of whom, his faithful house-keeper and devoted nurse to the last, had been in his service 65 years; another, above 20 years; and a third, who preceded him by a few months to the grave, had been in his service and that of the College for 54 years.” Facts like these disclose a domestic interior both interesting and venerable.

The illness which brought this remarkable life to a close was neither long nor very severe. He was confined to his bed but four days, and then his spirit was loosed from its bodily tabernacle on the morning of the last sabbath in August, so gently that the precise moment of his departure was scarcely known.

His remains were followed to their resting-place in the family vault in the burial-ground of St. Saviour-Gate chapel by a large number of reverent mourners, composed of his fellow-citizens of all creeds and classes, as well as the sorrowing members of his congregation. On the following Sunday, an appropriate and beautiful tribute was paid to his character and public services in the pulpit which he himself had occupied for more than sixty years, by the Rev. Thomas Hincks. At Manchester, a sermon not inferior to that of Mr. Hincks was preached by Rev. William Gaskell. At Bradford, Southampton, Halifax and Hackney, funeral sermons were preached by the respective ministers of the Unitarian congregations in these places.

This is Mr. Hincks’s tribute to Mr Wellbeloved’s character:

“It was characteristic of our departed friend that he overcame sectarian antipathies by his kindly and conciliatory bearing, and brought

himself into relation and co-operation with those from whom he differed most widely in religious belief. He afforded a striking illustration of the power of simple character in securing respect and social influence, in the face of sectarian prejudice and bigotry.

“Mr. Wellbeloved was indeed singularly free from the spirit of the partisan. As a seeker for truth he was calm and judicial. He never fell into dogmatism. The noise and one-sidedness of party warfare were distasteful to him, and though he had shewn that he could wield the weapons of the controversialist in time of need, he chiefly delighted in the practical aspects and applications of religion. From all the occasional divisions of our Body he kept steadily aloof. We missed him in the conflict of Schools, and the debate on Sectional differences. He was as a solid bulwark of erudition, remote from our transient strifes, and guarding our common territory.

“And he was a Student—a worker and learner—almost till the close of life. Beautiful it was to see that the old enthusiasm survived, that the old thirst for knowledge had not passed away, even in the late evening of existence. God had blessed him with clear intellect and vigorous faculty almost to the last, and almost to the last he was engaged in honourable service,—working in the interest of science, and shedding the light of his gathered erudition on that Book which he had laboured so long to illustrate.”—P. 6.

We have yet to speak of Mr. Wellbeloved’s publications. We will endeavour to class them by their subject rather than by the time of their appearance, introducing the subject by a reference to his antiquarian works.

In 1842, he published, “Eburacum, or York under the Romans,” a handsome octavo volume, illustrated with plans and numerous engravings. The outline of this work had formed the subject of a paper read by him at the weekly meeting of some members of the Yorkshire Philosophical Society. Two causes had combined in a remarkable way to reveal some of the under-ground secrets of ancient York: 1st, the innovations of railway companies, who, armed with the omnipotent forces of Acts of Parliament, pulled down old buildings, forced their way through the ramparts, and levelled mounds which contained the accumulated spoils of many centuries; 2ndly, the new and extensive sewerage, the necessity for which to the health of the city had been made painfully apparent by the wide-spread ravages of the cholera and the general mortal statistics of the inhabitants. In these processes the necessary excavations brought to light portions of the wall and other remains of the Roman station of Eburacum. The interest which his paper excited led to a request from the Council that he would deliver a course of lectures on the Roman antiquities in their richly-stored Museum. This he did, but gave his lectures a general and permanent value by weaving these archæological details into a local history. These lectures, greatly amplified, form the volume entitled “Eburacum.” The account with which it opens of the progress of the Roman arms in Britain is,

we believe, the best existing epitome of Roman transactions in our island. The section on Roman roads is equally valuable, and illustrates his power in condensing and placing perspicuously before the reader materials collected from widely-scattered sources. The descriptions of Roman sepulchral monuments, coffins, altars, votive tablets, tessellated pavements, pottery and other articles, are admirable specimens of a kind of writing, the difficulties of which can only be realized by those who have attempted it. An accomplished living antiquary recently described the "Eburacum" as an excellent book which exhausted its subject and needed few corrections, none indeed of any importance. When this work was published, the under-ground discoveries were not completed, but all that was afterwards brought to light happily confirmed our author's description, which was of necessity partly based on conjecture, of Roman York.

The other antiquarian publications of Mr. Wellbeloved were,

1. "A Guide to the Cathedral Church of St. Peter's, York, commonly called York Minster,"—an excellent manual, of which the public shewed their appreciation by purchasing many editions; the information it contains has formed the basis of all subsequent popular descriptions of the Minster. In relation to this publication we must borrow the language of the admirable biographical tribute, already referred to, which appeared in the York Herald:—"A mind so richly stored with historical knowledge, and so sensitive to every impression of beauty and grandeur, as Mr. Wellbeloved's, could not fail to be interested in those objects of antiquity with which our venerable city abounds. His education in the metropolis, where modern civilization has buried all remains of Roman art, and nearly effaced even the traces of mediæval times, had not been favourable to the development of antiquarian tastes; but they awoke when he found himself in Eburacum, and had daily before his eyes one of the noblest monuments of English ecclesiastical architecture. The history of our cathedrals and churches has now become a branch of popular knowledge; every incumbent can give the date of his nave, his transept, or his chancel; the very sexton can discriminate the early English, the decorated, and the perpendicular. It was otherwise when Mr. Wellbeloved undertook to describe the architecture of York Minster. Gray and Bentham, Milner and Carter, had laid the foundations of an exact chronology of church architecture, but their labours were little known. With few exceptions, such as that of Dean Markham, at York, the authorized guardians of our cathedrals were ignorant of their duty or indifferent to its performance, and those who shewed them to visitors committed the most absurd mistakes in assigning their ages to the different parts of the fabric. Mr. Wellbeloved's little work has long been out of print, but any one who consults it will

be struck not less with the accuracy of its discrimination than with the exquisite taste with which the beauty of the building is described. His admiration of it was enthusiastic. Long after he had been a resident in York, he said to one to whom he was explaining it, that though he passed it every day of his life, he always found something new to admire."

2. A "History of St. Mary's Abbey," accompanying the Plates published by the Society of Antiquaries, as a part of the *Vetusta Monumenta*.

3. "A Descriptive Account of the Antiquities in the Grounds and in the Museum of the Yorkshire Philosophical Society." This little volume has received and well deserves the praise of "comprehensiveness in its general views and accuracy in its minute details." When it is known that in preparing it he was assisted by the filial zeal and rare learning of Mr. Kenrick, who contributed the whole of "the full and instructive description of the Egyptian antiquities," it will surprise no one that this descriptive account is a model for all similar works.

4. "Observations on a Roman Inscription lately discovered in York," 1855; in the Proceedings of the Yorkshire Philosophical Society, P. ii.

In biography, Mr. Wellbeloved was the author of,

1. "Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the late Rev. W. Wood, F.L.S., and Minister of the Protestant Dissenting Chapel at Mill-Hill, in Leeds," 1809. To this he subjoined the Funeral Address and Sermon. This is a very instructive volume, which, independently of its importance as the record of the life of an excellent man and indefatigable minister, contains many details in respect to education which have by no means lost their value by the lapse of half a century.

2. "Memoir of Thomas Thrush, Esq., formerly an Officer of Rank in the Navy, who resigned his Commission on the Ground of the Unreasonableness of War." This is the well-told life of a man whom Dr. Gannett has described as "an example of self-sacrificing conscientiousness, steadfast integrity, Christian faith and practical piety."

He also prefixed a Memoir of his friend, Mr. Watson, of Whitby, to a posthumous volume of Sermons which he edited.

Under this head we may place Mr. Wellbeloved's funeral sermons for Dr. Robert Cappe (1863), for Mrs. Cappe, the widow of his predecessor (1821), and for Mr. Richmond, of Stockton-on-Tees.

The single sermons and other occasional pulpit addresses published by Mr. Wellbeloved were,

1. A Fast Sermon, Oct. 19, 1803.

2. "Objects of Pursuit proper to Young Persons who have received a Liberal Education," 1811. To this sermon, preached at York at the close of the College session, 1809-10, its author

added part of an “Address delivered to a Class of Divinity Students at the Conclusion of a Course of Study.”

3. “The Religious and Moral Improvement of Mankind the constant End of the Divine Government,” 1815. This sermon, preached at Leeds before the ministers of the West-Riding, and printed at the expense of the laymen present, was the prelude to the establishment on that occasion of the West-Riding Book and Tract Society.

4. The Charge at the ordination of Rev. John James Tayler, B.A., 1821.

5. “A Sermon in aid of a Subscription for the Erection of a Unitarian Chapel in Calcutta,” 1825. This fine discourse had the effect of awakening the zeal of our churches in the matter of Unitarianism in the East Indies.

Mr. Wellbeloved during his long ministry published only four sermons directly controversial in their character :

1. “The Principles of Roman Catholics and Unitarians contrasted,” 1800. This was occasioned by Bishop Horsley’s intemperate attack on Unitarians in his circular letter to the clergy of his diocese. It was preached Nov. 5, 1799 (a week-day service in commemoration of the day). The late Mr. Aspland, no mean judge of a sermon, held this discourse in very high estimation.

2. “The Doctrine of Instantaneous Conversion from Sin to Holiness, a Doctrine unsupported by Scripture;” preached before the Association of Unitarian Christians residing at Hull, Gainsborough, Thorne and adjacent places, at the chapel, Bowl-Alley Lane, Hull, Sept. 30, 1818.

3. “Unitarians not guilty of denying the Lord that bought them;” preached at Hull, Sept. 18, 1823.

4. “The Mystery of Godliness;” preached at Halifax on Wednesday, May 11, 1825, before the members of the West-Riding Tract Society, &c.

All of these are model sermons of their class for precise statement of doctrinal truth, clear scripture exposition and earnest appeal. With these sermons in his recollection, Mr. Gaskell has well said, “Though he was not fond of disturbing the day of rest with battle signs, but ever preferred dwelling on the great themes of piety and goodness, still his trumpet gave no uncertain sound, but clearly conveyed a faithful message to the listening ear. He did not confound good-nature and charity, or imagine that religion can be served by acquiescence in falsehood, but ever sought, ‘by manifestation of the truth, to commend himself to the consciences of men in the sight of God.’ Rarely as he left his own pulpit for others’, he had made himself an honoured name throughout our whole denomination.”

Mr. Wellbeloved was the author of a volume of “Devotional Exercises for the Use of Young Persons,” which passed through

numerous editions, and is still largely used. Of it Mr. James Yates has pronounced this opinion: "I believe that few books have contributed more to cherish the spirit of piety in young persons,"—an eulogium better worth deserving than that of varied learning or rare eloquence.

The most important of Mr. Wellbeloved's works was his Translation of the Bible,—one, however, which did not reach the extent or completeness originally contemplated by him. The portions published are, indeed, complete in themselves, and form a most valuable addition to annotated English translations of the Old Testament. They comprise the whole of the Pentateuch, the poetical books of Job, the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Solomon's Song. These books form the first and third parts of the entire work, as originally planned; the Historical Books (Part II.) and the Prophetical Books (Part IV.) not having been published by Mr. Wellbeloved.*

The author's design in entering upon a task of such magnitude may be learnt from a few sentences of his General Introduction (pp. xxxiii-iv): "The Editor of the present work," he writes, "was induced to undertake it, chiefly by the desire of providing for that class of Christians to which he belongs, an edition of the Bible furnished with explanatory Notes and Reflections not at variance with the principles of their religious faith. The want of such a work had long been felt by them; the notes and comments of almost all the editions of the Bible hitherto published containing and strenuously inculcating such views of scripture doctrine as appeared to them not founded in truth. He might have adapted Notes and Reflections to the text of the authorized English version; making only such occasional corrections in it as he should deem necessary or expedient. Such a method of proceeding, he was indeed advised by some to adopt; and had he followed that advice, his labour and anxiety would have been greatly diminished. But with this he could not feel satisfied. He foresaw that his corrections would be very numerous, and greatly incumber the notes; and that such a method would not be consistent with the desire he had to exhibit the poetical portions of the original, in a corresponding form in a translation. He determined, therefore, to follow, though with faltering steps and at a humble distance, the example of many eminent persons of different ages and countries, and to attempt a complete revision and correction of the version." The Editor further writes: "When he entered upon his work he avowed it to be his intention to adhere to the common version as closely as might be consistent with his giving a faithful and intelligible representation

* A Version of the Minor Prophets from his pen is to form part of the revised edition of the Old Testament to be published under the direction of the British and Foreign Unitarian Association. The books of Joshua, Judges and Ruth will be given from a revision which he had left in MS.

of the original; and he trusts it will be found he has not rashly and needlessly departed from the rule he prescribed to himself. Yet as in many instances he has felt himself obliged on sound principles of criticism, as he thinks, to abandon the received Hebrew text, the basis of the authorized version, and also to give to many Hebrew words a sense very different from that given by King James' translators, he thought himself bound to render some account of his reasons for so doing; and to cite the authorities by which, in every important instance, he had been determined. Hence the introduction of the Critical Remarks, subjoined to each of the Parts into which he has divided the Old Testament, and which may appear, at first sight, to be out of place in a Bible designed for family reading. But to have withheld such remarks would not have been just to himself, or satisfactory to those who may think the work worthy of their attention."

From these statements we learn something not only of the Editor's leading object in the execution of the work, but also of the principles on which he proceeded in reference both to the Hebrew text, and to the authorized English version. We see (1) that the work (as the title indeed informs us) was "designed chiefly for the use of families;" (2) that the Editor sought to construct for himself from the appropriate critical sources a better Hebrew text than that which lies at the basis of the authorized version: and (3) that he felt himself at full liberty to leave the latter whenever he thought his original required it. It is evidently necessary to keep these facts in view, in endeavouring to form an estimate of the general character and value of the work. The principles enunciated, or rather implied, under the second and third heads are in themselves perfectly sound and good. Most probably every reader would admit this, as an abstract proposition; but yet many persons will shrink from the consequences to which such principles necessarily lead when carried into execution, and will be ready at times to censure a translator who, faithful to them, is constrained to deviate from the more familiar words and phrases of the authorized version.

It is, indeed, very difficult, perhaps impossible, to lay down any rule in regard to deviations from that version. Taste and feeling so greatly vary, that probably no two persons will long agree as to what should be retained, what should be altered. What may seem the most perfect of rules or principles of action, when stated alone and in the abstract, is sooner or later found at fault, when you come to the actual process of revision; and the most careful translator will find, at times, that he has hardly any available course but to do what lays him open to the charge of inconsistency and the violation of his own first principles.

But to return to the work of which we have here more particularly to speak. Only one who has minutely examined it can

be aware of the great and conscientious care and accuracy with which the principles indicated have been carried out in it. In the translation, every word, it is quite evident, has been well weighed, and if in any place more than in others, we have no doubt whatever that those places are precisely those which differ most widely from the authorized version. The objection of a certain unsteadiness, or want of uniformity, of rendering, may, we are aware, be brought against various passages. But, in considering this objection, it must be remembered, as we have said, that the work was intended principally for the use of families and to aid in the cultivation of religious feeling—not merely or specially for learned and critical readers. Had the latter been prominently in the author's contemplation, he would, most probably, have been as careful to observe all possible uniformity, as any one could be, or could wish to be, and as he was eminently able to be had he so desired. But considering the principal intention of the work as a Family Bible, it must be granted that some latitude of rendering was fairly allowable, in order that the translator might express more directly and strongly the substantial meaning which he believed his original to convey, and which a close literal rendering might have failed to give. It must not be forgotten, also, that among the best scholars of a former day a greater variety of meanings was assigned to certain Hebrew words than has been in more recent years allowed—a fact which will account for some of the departures from uniformity to which we have alluded.

Of the relation of Mr. Wellbeloved's text to that of the authorized version, we need not attempt to speak at any length. Those who are familiar with the phraseology of the latter will doubtless miss many of its characteristic words and expressions. This happens, too, in numerous passages which are the most frequently read and the most highly valued by all devout readers of the Scriptures. We must allow that cases occur in which changes have been made in the well-known wording of the common version which were not absolutely *necessary*. We venture to express the hope that in all such cases a restoration of the common renderings will be made, wherever practicable with a due regard to the original, in the reprint of Mr. Wellbeloved's portion, in the edition of the Old Testament to be published by the Unitarian Association. This we would counsel, however, more from a regard to the feeling of sensitive readers of the Scriptures than, generally speaking, on the ground of any deficiency of literal correctness in Mr. Wellbeloved's renderings. In these, we are convinced, no alteration will be found to have been made for which excellent authority may not be produced; none in which the translator's thoughtful judgment has not been carefully exercised. This is a conviction which a long familiarity with the work has ever tended to deepen. At the same time we freely admit that

passages may be found which are capable of improvement. We have no doubt that the learned and excellent author himself, could he again have gone over his translation with the writings of the more recent Biblical scholars in his hand, would have admitted the same thing as readily as any one; and that he would have been equally anxious to make any needed correction.

The books of Job and Proverbs—the former of which is perhaps the most difficult of the books translated by Mr. Wellbeloved—are those in which, as we are inclined to think, his excellent judgment and learning have produced the best results. In saying this, we refer not only to the explanatory notes which are always apposite, and full of matter neatly, often elegantly, expressed, but also to the translation itself, which is everywhere characterized by the carefulness and good judgment of the Editor. A learned and critical reader may sometimes, indeed, dissent from his conception of the general scope of a passage, or from the rendering of a word or phrase, in such a book as Job; yet he will invariably see that his translator has duly had the various possible renderings before him, and has not selected that which he has adopted without much knowledge and discrimination. The result is an English text often differing greatly, in the books named, from the common English version; a text, however, also frequently presenting an intelligible and interesting meaning, where the common text has hardly any sense: e. g. Job xxviii. and the close of Job xxxvi.: but the reader is less startled or offended by such differences in these books than in passages of the Psalms or of the prose books which are more familiar to him from being more frequently read.

The different books forming the two published parts of Mr. Wellbeloved's Bible are each preceded by an Introduction, giving much matter in a condensed form relating to the age, the contents, the authorship and design of each book, with some account of the opinions which have been held by various writers on these subjects. In these Introductions the reader will find that the author represents the maturest scholarship of his time. He manifests, we need not say, an essentially conservative spirit. The Pentateuch he holds to be substantially one continuous work, and mainly, as we have it, from the hand of Moses. A much larger proportion of the Psalms than the more recent criticism has allowed is attributed to the pen of David; and the book of Job is most probably "at least as old as the writings of Moses." With this conservatism there is ever combined, however, no inconsiderable share of freedom and discrimination in the treatment both of critical and theological points: witness the explanation given of the account of the temptation and disobedience of our first parents, and the Introduction to Solomon's Song, which it is maintained is simply an amatory poem, not in any proper sense a religious work. What, however, to our mind constitutes the

great charm of this work is the truly candid and devout spirit which everywhere pervades the Notes and the Reflections; a spirit which makes it, we think, a model work of its class, and excellently fits it for the leading purpose contemplated in its composition,—use in the family circle. The Notes, we need not add, are full of illustrative matter, and, though frequently a little too diffuse, almost always contain something that is worth having, and often is not readily suggested by the passage itself. They thus, in effect, educe from the words of the sacred writer a fuller and richer meaning than the ordinary reader, hastily running over them, would be able to detect. This is particularly the case in the exposition of the Proverbs, and in parts of Job and the Psalms—less so, of course, in the Pentateuch.

Mr. Wellbeloved's Translation, as far as it goes, is a most valuable contribution to Biblical literature. It is to be regretted that for this life labour its author received no reward, beyond the respect and gratitude of a little band of congenial minds, and the consciousness of having meant and done well. The "poor encouragement" it received is spoken of by Mr. Gaskell as "a reproach to our denomination." So in part it was; but it must be remembered that the long intervals of time between the publication of the several parts thinned the number of the original subscribers, and that its publication had unfortunately been confided to one who wanted every quality essential to an enterprizing and successful tradesman.

Reviewing the life and works of the venerable man to whose memory the series of papers now brought to a close is a very inadequate tribute, we echo Mr. Gaskell's praise of him as one who "was found watching daily at the gates of Wisdom, and waiting at the posts of her doors," searching for truth as for silver, and digging for it as hidden treasure. With him, we join in the lamentation that "a master in our Israel has fallen." Before concluding, we venture to express the hope that the public may be put in possession of a volume of his Remains. They are in the keeping of one whose learning and judgment will enable him to select that alone which will perpetuate Mr. Wellbeloved's well-earned reputation, and who needs no stimulus that our words can apply to excite his reverence for the memory of our departed teacher and friend.*

* We find that we were in error in stating in a former chapter that Mr. Wellbeloved when in Scotland had visited Glencoe. The scene in question took place in Glencoe, described in the *Pleasure Tours of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1827) as "next to Glencoe the most romantic of all the Highland passes." It was of this scene that Mr. Wellbeloved expressed his strong admiration, and the similarity of name led to his giving, with deep interest, the narrative of the massacre of Glencoe.

MR. SHARPE ON THE WORD "BAPTIZE."

SIR,

YOUR respected correspondent, the Rev. J. C. Means, in his letter on the Revision of the Authorized Version, defends the use by the Baptists of the word "immerse," in place of "baptize," and adds, "we may be mistaken; but let those who think so give us a word that shall better convey the ordinary meaning of *βαπτιζειν*;" and in answer to this challenge, I wish to make a few remarks.

The New Testament, like most other books, is sprinkled up and down with technical words, which bear a peculiar or scientific meaning, and which therefore cannot be rendered by words suitable for other occasions. Such is the word *ανθυπατος*, *proconsul*, which the Authorized Version misrepresents by the untechnical or general word "deputy." It also contains another set of words which are used sometimes technically, and sometimes with their ordinary meaning. Such is the word *αγγελος*, which in many places in the New Testament bears its simple meaning of "messenger," and in other places bears a technical meaning of "messenger from heaven;" and for these places the translators have been driven to coin a new English word, and they translate it "angel." Another such word is *Χριστος*, which in many places we translate "Anointed," but in other places we create for it the peculiar word "Christ," meaning sometimes the expected prophet, and at other times Jesus himself, who was declared to be that expected prophet. Now it will be immediately seen that there falls upon the translator of the New Testament the duty of determining in every place, whether a word there bears its peculiar meaning or its general meaning; and in most cases sad nonsense would be made of a sentence by a wrong decision. For example, let a translator write in 2 Cor. xii. 2, "I knew a man in Anointed;" or in Galat. i. 22, "The churches of Judea which were in Anointed;" or in Luke vii. 24, "When John's angels were gone;" or in James ii. 25, "Rahab received the angels;" and it will be at once seen that in these places, to make sense, we want the technical word, and not the ordinary word.

Equally important would be the mistake if we used the technical word when it was not wanted. This mistake King James's translators have made in Acts i. 20, "His charge let another take;" which they have translated, "His bishopric let another take;" and in 1 Peter ii. 25, "The shepherd and overseer of your souls;" which they have translated, "the bishop of your souls."

It is not, however, necessary in every case to coin a new English word, like Angel, Bishop, Baptize, to represent a Greek technical word. Thus the Epistle of James is written "to the twelve tribes who are in the Dispersion," and the first Epistle of Peter is written "to the pilgrims of the Dispersion." Here the English word "Dispersion" well represents the Greek word with its technical meaning by the help of the arrangement of the sentence; and we may observe how the technicality is destroyed in the Authorized Version by its use of the words "scattered abroad."

Having said thus much by way of preface, I venture to give my opinion, first, that *βαπτιζειν* is a technical word, if not always in the classics, at any rate in the New Testament; and that whereas *βαπτειν* means to immerse or dip, in an ordinary sense, *βαπτιζειν* means to immerse or dip

in a peculiar religious sense; and if we translate it by an ordinary word, which does not convey the peculiar and religious meaning, we by no means translate it fairly: secondly, that in the New Testament, the peculiar meaning of *βαπτιζειν* so far rises in importance above the ordinary meaning, that it is sometimes used for purification by dipping or immersion, when the thought of the immersion is almost lost, and sometimes in a figurative sense, where no immersion or dipping whatever is intended. Of this first we may take as instances Mark i. 4, and of the latter, Mark x. 39 and 1 Cor. xv. 29.

Mark i. 4, "John was preaching a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins." Here the technical meaning and thought of religious purification rises so far above the ordinary meaning, that to use the words "an immersion of repentance" would be almost nonsense. So would be the title of "John the Immerser." I do not say that, if we adopted these words into the New Testament, but that in one, two or three centuries they might acquire the wished-for meaning. I only say that now they would not be a just translation of the Greek.

The argument which I would build on the latter passages will hardly be seen till we have corrected the translation from the Authorized Version. In Mark x. 39, when the Saviour says, "Can ye be baptized with the baptism that I am being baptized with?" he means, "Can ye endure the purification and sanctification by sufferings that I am being purified with?" When the Apostle Paul says in 1 Cor. xv. 29, "What shall they do who are being baptized over the dead?" he means, "Those of us who are being purified by our sufferings for Christianity's sake," which purification he thus compares to the sprinkling of the attendants at a funeral, to purify them, after having been near to a dead body, as if the disciples had been attendants at the funeral of the Saviour. Now in these passages "immersion" will not in the least represent the required thought. To use any but a technical word is to destroy the meaning of the Greek.

Having said thus much against Mr. Means's proposed word "immersion," I cannot but add my opinion that the baptism practised by the immediate disciples of our Lord was always what I believe is now called Believers' baptism, after a profession of religious amendment; and I should think always by immersion.

In conclusion, if the word Baptize is objected to, we have to find another English word which can be correctly used in the following sentences: To baptize in water; to baptize with the holy spirit; to baptize with sufferings; a baptism of repentance; and John the Baptist. For these meanings the word "immerse" would certainly be found very inconvenient; and I can by no means grant that we ought to adopt it in order to make it impossible to write "immersion by sprinkling," and "immersion with the sign of the cross." We have words in the Authorized Version which have been warped from their original meaning, such as "Gospel" and "Atonement," which to the uneducated reader convey no notion of "good tidings" and "reconciliation." Such words it is desirable to get rid of. But I would argue against my friend Mr. Means that the word "baptize," used as it has been for so many centuries, conveys to the English reader the various meanings of the Greek more nearly than any other English word that I know of.

SAMUEL SHARPE.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Reform in 1859, a Second Letter addressed to the Right Hon. Lord John Russell, M.P. By Edmund Potter, F.R.S. [Printed, but not published, and inscribed "with the Author's compliments."]

WHATEVER Mr. Potter prints is sure to repay a careful reading, whether on Lord John Russell's part as a statesman, or on ours as simple citizens. His views represent those of the highest-minded manufacturers, on behalf of their operatives quite as much as on their own.

It is by no means clear to us that there is any such general and urgent popular demand for Reform as some of our politicians represent; and we much doubt (with Mr. Potter) the disposition of our rulers, whether Whig, Tory or Palmerstonian, to do more in this matter than may be absolutely wrung from them. But Mr. Potter is truly wise in urging that this very time of quiet, which looks like public indifference, is the fittest time for statesmen of bold political forethought to act. After speaking of the last Reform Bill as a great step yielded after being long and dangerously delayed, "a concession made gracefully enough by the Whigs, very reluctantly by the Tories," and of the more recent abolition of the Corn Laws under pressure of the League, aided by "misery, fear and the potatoe rot," he asks :

"Is Reform, with a full expansion of the franchise to all who have a right to it, to be so gained or given; or is there any statesman to be found who has courage, moral courage of the very highest class, to pronounce for, and carry into effect with the boldest political forethought, a measure which might do more for civilization than any event which history has yet recorded; has he the courage *now*, when, during a time of prosperity, a period of quiet thoughtfulness might be devoted to its calm consideration?"

Again he urges in his concluding paragraph :

"The time for a Reform Bill seems to me singularly propitious. We are open to quiet conviction; political parties are so mixed, that no one seems to care to revive either of the two older ones; but every honest man would wish to aid in forming a new party, qualified by intelligence and honesty of purpose to carry forward a measure of Reform which would tend, through our example, to the physical and mental happiness and improvement of the whole human race."

Mr. Potter's Letter of a year ago was principally devoted to the advocacy of the Ballot, on which his opinion is now only more confirmed; this is devoted chiefly to the Suffrage, on which he surprises us by declaring "that the opinions and suggestions of 1857 would be worthless in 1859." At least, we do not move quite so fast ourselves. But let us examine the suggestions offered for 1859, and hope to find them such as we can adhere to not only in passing a Bill, but in using it for twenty or thirty years at least as a law; for it is most important (without dogmatic *finality*) to have laws made for use and not for perpetual change.

The recent Act which authorizes the payment of expenses in carrying electors to the poll, is denounced by Mr. Potter (and we think rightly) as tending further to demoralize both the constituencies and the representatives, and as shewing how "large portions of all parties

in the House, Radicals, Whigs and Conservatives, still cling to the money power of obtaining a seat."

Mr. Potter last year proposed an £8 qualification; he now feels convinced that nothing less than "a complete rating suffrage" will suffice, with "any intelligent extension of it, even to an educational qualification." He would assimilate the borough and county franchise; and sees no common measure short of that of paying rates to the poor. He vindicates the present fitness of the rate-payers at large in the manufacturing districts (which are well understood by him), and anticipates the rapid improvement of the agricultural voters, under protection of the ballot, of course. He would let no man have more than one vote. He cares little for the cry of *equal* electoral districts, but would collect into new boroughs the large towns and villages in the manufacturing districts, which now vote as parts of counties. His faith in the safety of so large an extension of the suffrage rests not only on his generous confidence in his fellow-men, but also on the increased difficulty of treating or bribing such large constituencies, and on the certainty that the Ballot must follow, if it do not accompany, such a Reform.

We have sometimes wondered that, among the suggestions for a largely-extended suffrage, no one should have suggested as its accompaniment a *higher limitation of age*. Yet we need not wonder; because such a suggestion would be sure to be unpopular. Yet it would not be unjust nor invidious, as it would of course apply to all classes of society alike. The fear of the consequences even of *manhood* or *universal* suffrage, would be much diminished, if manhood for the purposes of the suffrage began at twenty-five instead of twenty-one. The sowing of political "wild oats" is done chiefly between eighteen and twenty-five, and it is not unnatural to believe that men in all classes of society would understand and value their political franchise better if they had it a little longer in prospect and earnest thought before being called to exercise it. If any such new limitation in point of age should be entertained by our next Ministers of Reform, the occasion for proposing it would certainly be in connection with a very large extension of the franchise in point of rating qualification.

Mr. Potter expresses another right manly confidence in the influence of freedom of trade. And in this connection he gives a decided preference to the direct above the indirect system of taxation, and declares his opinion that the working classes are overtaxed now through the pressure of the indirect taxes on consumption. This latter opinion is somewhat startling to those of the middle classes who have felt almost all recent measures of finance as pure *additions to their burdens*. He deprecates the anticipated removal of the Income and Property tax, and would have the former extended to £50 incomes, and the duties on tea, sugar, malt, &c., greatly reduced, if not some of them repealed. But he does not go the length of the Liverpool Financial Reform Association, who astonished Sir James Stephen in the Economical Section of the Social Science Association, the other day, by proposing to provide the whole revenue of the country by a Property and Income tax just four-fold the amount of our late sixteen-pence in the pound! And he is far too clear-headed to regard our indirect taxes for pure revenue as sins against free-trade, so long as Custom-dues are levied, undifferentiably, on foreign produce not also of home growth, and Inland or Excise duties

are met by equivalent restraints on importation and drawbacks on exportation. In some of these latter there is indeed much vexatious interference for the collection of revenue; and of the former there are only 25 articles (including tea, sugar, tobacco, wine and spirits and timber) that are really worth laying under tribute. To make all other imports free at once is therefore perfectly practicable, and might greatly reduce our Customs' establishment, as well as give impulse to our foreign trade; while among home productions, the manufacture of paper most certainly claims to be set free from Excise charges and vexations. These fiscal matters afford scope for large statesmanship. Will our Chancellor of the Exchequer be disposed and able to deal with them soundly at once and liberally?

Hymns, Chants and Anthems, selected and arranged by John Hamilton Thom. London—Whitfield. 1858.

THERE is a disposition in some of our friends to raise a cry against the multiplication of Hymn Books and Forms of Prayer. This is scarcely wise, and is little consonant with the free spirit of our principles and churches. That there are both Hymn Books and Forms of Prayer which have found great and general favour among us is well, and the circumstance has obvious conveniences and advantages; but to found on this fact an argument that no other books of the kind ought to be published, or if published that they ought not to be countenanced, is an attempt to uphold a monopoly, and to put a check on all improvement. New hymns are being constantly put forth, some of them more successfully than those of a previous age, expressing pure and lofty devotional feelings. Why are our churches to be debarred the use of these? We are prepared to welcome into the field of Hymnology any man who, like Mr. Thom, brings to his work devotional feelings, a pure taste and a catholic spirit. The volume before us contains, in addition to psalms for chanting and the words of some well-known and accepted anthems, nearly 600 hymns. The editor appears to have gone on the principle of admitting into the selection all new hymns that have merit. To do this he has necessarily put aside many of our old favourites. Watts is not in this volume the sweet singer who has found most favour; but Montgomery occupies the first rank, there being more of his compositions inserted than of Watts and Doddridge added together. This will be regarded as a blemish or a beauty in the work according to the taste of the reader. If the volume were simply to be regarded as a collection of sacred songs for private use, we could understand why hymns found in every other collection are here omitted. But as a volume prepared to assist the public devotions of our churches, we demur to the propriety of preferring that which is new to that which is best.

The perusal of this volume gives us, on the whole, a feeling of satisfaction at the visible improvement going on in the style of our hymns. There is more tenderness and warm feeling in the modern lyrical utterance of devotion than of old. There is perhaps less grandeur, certainly of diction if not of thought. The hymns of Montgomery, Heber, Keble, Milman, have for the most part appeared in other Unitarian selections. The hymns of Miss Waring are striking and good, and are less generally known. Less excellent, perhaps, are those of Newman. Some beautiful

hymns appear without a name, and are both new and good. We have fewer hymns of Steele, Barbauld and Bowring, than we are prepared to welcome. The hymns of Fox are more rhetorical than poetical. Those of Mrs. Adams possess great pathos and delicacy. We had marked several hymns for extract, but must from want of space omit them. As a volume of religious poetry for private use, drawn from authors in almost every section of the Christian church, we cordially thank Mr. Thom for this choice and elegant volume. We add with some regret that we cannot commend the volume to Unitarian churches for use in their public services. The objection we are compelled to take is, that several of the hymns are suitable only to churches who recognize Christ as an object of supreme worship. We do not at all suspect that Mr. Thom wavers in his allegiance to Unitarianism. He, we do not doubt, has a theory or canon by which he brings all the compositions he has selected within the scope of proper Unitarian worship. He has given insertion to the spirited Unitarian poem (a hymn in the strict sense of the word it scarcely is) by Mr. H. A. Bright, beginning,

"To the Father, through the Son,
Did the ancient ritual run;
So the Christian prayer was said,
So the Christian vow was paid."

In another part of the poem these lines occur:

"Other prayers to Heaven arise,
Swell the new-made Litanies;
Single homage no more given
To the Father God of heaven."

Unfortunately, we have in this volume too many specimens of "other prayers" than "to the Father through the Son." To specify a few of them: Cowper's hymn (No. 193), beginning, "Heal us, Emanuel," is throughout a prayer to Christ. Who should doubt that Heber's hymn, beginning,

"Incarnate Word, who, wont to dwell
In lowly shape and cottage cell,
Didst not refuse a guest to be
At Cana's poor festivity,"—

is a prayer to Christ? Montgomery's hymn (No. 171) is open to the same objection. In short, many of the hymns under the second class of subjects, "Christ and Christianity," are such as, in our opinion, an Unitarian worshiper ought to hesitate in using. We admit that there is a shade of difference in a hymn and a prayer. In the former, hyperboles may be tolerated which would be in the latter wrong. But when the hymn assumes, as some of these do, the form of a prayer, then, we submit, correctness of theology is an essential quality. The state of opinion in the Christian world is such, that we cannot with propriety drop the assertion of our distinctive creed as the worshipers of one God, the Father. If "orthodox" worshipers see in us a practical indifference to the great article of our faith, and recognize in our customary worship expressions and entire hymns proper only to those who worship Christ as well as the Father, the result will be equally disadvantageous to us as a denomination, and to those principles the acceptance of which separates us from the rest of the Christian world.

INTELLIGENCE.

PRESENTATION AT CLEATOR.

A room having been built and fitted up by Thomas Ainsworth, Esq., of The Floss, at his flax-spinning mill at Cleator, near Whitehaven, for his own family accommodation, he threw the monthly religious services there open to all who chose to attend. A small but respectable number of persons resident in the neighbourhood availed themselves of the privilege, and, to shew their appreciation thereof, they of their own accord raised a subscription amongst themselves a few weeks ago, which ultimately resolved itself, with Mr. Ainsworth's consent, into the purchase of a number of Bibles, to be laid upon the reading-desk and pews for congregational use. The presentation was made on Tuesday evening, the 7th December, and on the occasion Mr. and Mrs. Ainsworth invited the subscribers to tea.

Tea and the presentation took place in the neat little room. The latter was decorated with evergreens, and the arrangements of the table were all elegant. Mr. and Mrs. Ainsworth presided. Between thirty and forty were present.

After tea the Bibles were produced. They comprised forty-two copies of the Bible in plain but useful binding, designed for the pews; and a quarto copy, handsomely bound and gilt, for the desk. All of them were the authorized version in common use, from the Oxford press.

The presentation was made by Mr. Jas. Dalzell, after reading the following address:

"Mr. AINSWORTH: Sir,—The members of this meeting who are attenders at your private religious services, though not Unitarians, have long thought themselves very much indebted to you for the privileges they have had of attending those services. It has for some time been a question as to how the members could best shew their gratitude towards you; and after due thought it has been determined to present to you, for the benefit of these divine services, the Bibles (now before me) which I now do in the name of this meeting; and it is the earnest wish of each and every member present that the blessings to be derived from the sacred volume may ever be with you and yours.

"That these services have been of great benefit to all who have heard them, is the belief of all present. From the liberal, charitable and truly Christian spirit pervading the sermons which have been preached here, it is the conviction of all

present that the true gospel of Jesus Christ is preached in its purity. These discourses have been the means of removing, from many who have heard them, doubts and difficulties regarding the religious opinions of Unitarians, and have also taught that religion taken in its fullest sense is what man ought to be controlled by in his week-day as well as in his Sunday actions."

Mr. AINSWORTH, in reply, said he did not know that ever he felt so much in his life as he did on this occasion. They had come to him in one of the most private relations of life. They had, as it were, become members of his own family. He felt towards them as if they were such, and as such he should take the liberty of addressing them. In the first place, he thanked them—which he did from the very bottom of his heart—for the very kind way in which they had addressed him. The present they had made of the materials for worship in this room was a generous one; it was a very graceful one. He did not know how, in any possible way, they could have better shewn the appreciation they said they had of the services which had been established there. That these had had the beneficial effect stated, he fully believed. They had had that effect on himself; and that being so, he did not see why they should not have had the same effect upon them. To shew that he believed they had been productive of such effect, he should take the liberty of reading to them a portion of the paper that he presented at Midsummer to the Provincial Meeting which sent the ministers to them during the twelve months. Those services had been in operation now for ten full years, and the present was the eleventh. He thought it was therefore right to tell the ministers who came here, when they were assembled at their annual meeting, the effect which he believed those services had had upon the community at large, and upon this district in particular. Mr. Ainsworth then read the following extract from the paper referred to:

"While all these sects, from the highest to the lowest, have been preaching down to the people and their prejudices, your Committee has sent men who have endeavoured and succeeded in preaching, through a rational Christianity and a loving faith, their hearers up to nobler endeavours; and the result has been, that we have been the representatives of the intelligence, charity, peace and goodwill of the district."

Mr. AINSWORTH then proceeded : They would remember that his reason for making that statement was, that about some six or eight months ago this parish was in a very, very unfortunate position. They had in it not only persons endeavouring to propagate their own particular views—not, as he thought, in that spirit of charity which became all Christians, but, as the meeting knew very well, they had in the parish bloodshed—disorder—riot—confusion ; and all under the specious name of Religion. He believed that if it had not been for some of the worshipers that attended these services, those riots and those disgraceful scenes would have been greater than they were ; because he knew they had members of those communities, both Protestant and Catholic, attending the services here, and he believed that the spirit they saw manifested here, and the instructions they here received, they carried away with them into public life, and that their good common sense and brotherly love and charity stimulated and developed thereby, did more than all the laws and all the police force could do to put down those unseemly and disgraceful scenes. It was in that spirit and with that view that he made the observations he had read to them ; so that they had merely confirmed to-night what he had ventured to state six months ago as his impression of the result of the services here. He said in that paper, and they said here in their own address, that they were private services. To a certain extent they were, and had it been left entirely to himself, perhaps private they might have remained. But, thanks to his wife, he decided otherwise. When he told her what he thought he, as the father of a family, ought to do—that he ought to shew to his children, by such services, what his views were upon religion—she objected to their being carried on in their own house, as he originally intended them to be. She said if it was public worship he desired, it ought to be made public worship, and such it could not become if conducted in their own house ; whereas if the services were established in a place of common resort, a public character would be given them, and the people in the neighbourhood would have an opportunity of seeing and hearing and judging for themselves. He had reason to believe that was a wise view on Mrs. Ainsworth's part. At any rate, he fell into it, and the services which they had met this evening so pleasantly to commemorate were the result. And here perhaps they would allow him to recommend every father of a family here present, for the benefit of his children and his own comfort, to do the same thing—i. e. to profess

his own religious opinions, whatever those opinions might be. In making his profession, this was his own reasoning on the subject : He could not worship as a Trinitarian ; he could only worship as a Unitarian ; and if he did not go to a place of public worship, his children, as they grew up and saw what was going on in the world, would say—“There is either something or nothing in religion. My father, by his conduct in not attending a place of public worship, appears to say there is nothing.” But if they themselves thought otherwise, and that there really was something in religion, and if they saw their mother frequent a place of worship while he frequented none, they would say—“My mother must be a very good woman, and my father a very bad man.” To prevent the occurrence of so very unfortunate a thing in their domestic life, these services were instituted, and, as he told them before, had been made public. He would relate to them a little anecdote which would shew them the desirableness of all parents being perfectly open and honest in doing, in sight of their children and in the face of Almighty God, all which they thought necessary in a religious point of view to the well-being of their families and of society. Shortly after these services commenced, he was walking one day with his eldest boys, when, as they passed the Methodist chapel, one of them turned rather short and said, “Father, why don't you go to this chapel ?” The answer he gave was this—“Why don't you sit in the kitchen rather than in the parlour ?” “Because,” said he, “they can't tell me things.” “That is the very reason why I don't go to the Methodist chapel. They cannot tell me things. I don't think they are educated superior to myself ; and religion being in my eyes a very solemn and sacred thing, I can only go where I receive instruction.” By this means he was enabled to teach his boy to understand why he went to a place of worship ; and if he had not had these services, his answer must have been unintelligible, and he himself would have sunk into insignificance before his own child. And now that they had come so far as to say why these services had been instituted, perhaps they would think it necessary that he should say something with respect to Unitarianism, or, generally speaking, their system of belief. But, in the first place, he must premise that Unitarians did not look upon themselves as Dissenters. They did not consider that they *dissected* from any church. Some present had, perhaps, read and would remember Parker's Sermons, in which he said that one of the greatest errors of sys-

tems of religion was that, under them, people got off the A, B, C of their religion, but never went any further. Now, it appeared to him that that was very generally the case with the great multitude of religious societies. They got a little knowledge, the A, B, C of a system of religion, but they did not get and study religion as a science. By science he meant this—that all knowledge, whencesoever they got it—whether from their trades, their professions, from science or revelation—ought to be brought to bear in the opening out of their religious life. Now, as he said before, Unitarians did not consider themselves Dissenters. They treated religion as a science. All they could know, all the information they could get, they brought to bear upon this, and traced religious opinion through history, as far as they could trace it back, till they came and reposed with the greatest possible confidence on the Sacred Volume which was before them this night. They said in their paper here,—"From the liberal, charitable and truly Christian spirit pervading the sermons which have been preached here, it is the conviction of all present that the true gospel of Jesus Christ is preached in its purity." It had been wished by some among Unitarians that, as Unitarians, they should have a creed. He sincerely hoped that would never be the case. Every man must think for himself; every man ought to do so, and to go, with the greatest amount of knowledge he can get, to the Sacred Volume, and commune there,—the communion being thus between him and his Maker. He thought the Unitarian, by being without a creed, was more charitable, and for this reason: if he had a creed, he must say, "This is, and has been, my belief—this which I have said is the truth,"—and consequently he would read nature and revelation for proofs for his creed. Now, as it was, he says, "I have no creed. I look through nature up to nature's God; through revelation to revelation's God. I look at all the religious societies that differ from me; and if I see any good in this society or in that, I shall adopt it, and bring it into my own religious belief and life." If they would allow him, he would just go back and shew them what Unitarians ought to do, and what, generally speaking, he believed they did. The last phase almost of religious life that they had witnessed in England was the Methodist. That took place rather more than a hundred years ago. Now he said Unitarians, in looking at the Methodists, saw a great deal which they might take and incorporate with themselves. He alluded to their fervour

and zeal; for they knew that Methodists were both fervid and zealous. Going two hundred years back, they came to the Quakers. What had they? What was there peculiar in them? Were they not simple in their speech? Did they not say, "Yea, yea"—"Nay, nay"? Did they not also hold the idea that there was something indwelling in every man by which he ought to speak? Might not Unitarians take something from these Quakers and bring into their system of religion? Going back some twenty or thirty years further, they came to the Independents. They held the principle that every congregation should be an independent church—a church not dependent upon or carried along with a great stream of other churches all thrown together, but separate and independent. Was it not very reasonable that where people were of the same opinion they should unite and form themselves into a church, and be better able to manage their own affairs separately than if they were thrown, with many other churches, into a synod or larger body? Might not the Unitarians take something from the Independents? Let them go fifty years further back, and they came to the Presbyterians. Was there anything to be learnt from them? He did not think they were altogether right, but still he thought there was a very great deal to be learnt from them. There was their strict logic, their determination to carry everything to results; that was what had made Scotland what it was—that was what had prevented Scotland from falling into any ridiculous and foolish excitable religion, such as had been witnessed in this country. Therefore he thought Unitarians might take much from them. Going back a little further, they came to the establishment of the present English Church. Might not Unitarians learn much from them? With the large amount of money they had, they kept up a well-educated clergy. Was it not desirable that Unitarians should do the same? Going back a little further still, they came to the Baptists. Had they nothing? He took it—as far as his experience went—they as a sect read the Scriptures more literally than any other. On the subject of baptism, they certainly come nearer to the account we have of it in the Jewish church and in apostolic times. Was not Jesus Christ himself presented by his parents in the temple? but did not receive baptism till he came to man's estate. Might not Unitarians take something from the Baptists? Going back nearly a thousand years further, they came to the Catholic Church. That Church professed to be the original Church. He did not think it was estab-

blished, as a Church, till the year 600; but Constantine, the Roman emperor, adopted Christianity about 300 years after Christ. Had it not been for the Catholic Church in the dark ages, we should have had very little history brought down to us. They, the Catholics, might have an excess of faith, but there seemed to him to be some things in that Church which it was very desirable to see incorporated by Unitarians,—such as the keeping under subjection their passions by the mortification of their bodies; and they mortified their bodies when they put restraints upon themselves: with them it was by order of the Church. Could not Unitarians take something from that, and put their bodies and minds under discipline without priestly authority? But he would go back still further, for he did not want to stand by the Catholic Church—he could get nearer Christ. And now came his reason why he could not worship as a Trinitarian. For looking into that book (pointing to the Bibles before him), he saw no such word as the Trinity. Others might adopt the doctrine, and very likely with good reason; and if Trinitarianism was a blessing to them, let them adopt it. But the doctrine of the Trinity was not introduced into the church till the second century, by Theophilus, bishop of Antioch. Unitarians say, “This doctrine is not satisfactory to us.” So they go still further back, and take up the revealed word of God, and come to Jesus Christ. In going thus, as they professed, to Jesus Christ, what did they find? For still he carried on the train of history. Religion without history was almost nothing. He could not comprehend the religious belief of a country without taking its history into consideration. Religion, as he had said, was a science. It *grew*, like every other science; and in coming to those distant ages, they found preserved, in a most remarkable, marvellous way, the belief of the Jews, that there was only one creating Power, which creating Power was worshiped by the Jews as their particular God—as a national, not a universal God. But when they went to Jesus Christ, they found that he was the man who pulled down the veil from the face of that national God, and revealed him to mankind as the world’s God—our God—“our Father;” and he (Mr. A.) thought commenced only then the universal fatherhood of God, the universal brotherhood of man. “No man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whom the Son shall reveal him.” This was all, he believed, that Unitarians professed. They wished—and he sincerely hoped they would continue to do so—to stand out from other churches and other

systems, not as Dissenters, but so as to be able to gain the blessings and comforts that could be gained from contemplating the different attitudes of the different churches that had existed from the time of Jesus Christ down to the present day.—Now, then, that he had given them this summary—or, rather, this historical view—of religious belief, he would revert to that of religion as a science which grew, like everything else. The more that a man knew, the better religionist he ought to become. If they would allow him, he would take a simple feature of the present century, and ask them—for he thought they could all remember it—if it did not cause them, at the time the discovery was made known to them, to have some very different and enlarged ideas of the providence and wisdom and power of the Almighty? He alluded to the discovery of the force of electricity in its application to the electric telegraph. Here had been lying dormant, ever since the creation of the world, a great and mighty power of which they, and the other religionists he had enumerated, had known nothing. When this had been brought home to them, did it give them no idea of the power and goodness of the Almighty? Had they gained from it no knowledge? Ought they not to bring that knowledge back to bear on their religion? Whenever and wherever they gained knowledge, they ought to place it at the feet of the Almighty. In all the beautiful laws of nature they should acknowledge the *Lawgiver*. It gave them some new conception, new view, of the Almighty Mind; and that, as true Christians, they ought immediately to incorporate in their religious system.—They had spoken in their address of “the liberal, charitable and truly Christian spirit pervading the sermons which had been preached here.” He believed that if a person raised himself out of those particular stereotyped views of the Almighty and his government in this world, he was more likely to be a more progressive, and consequently a more liberal Christian, because if he was under the influence of all new knowledge that came to him, he would say, “Though I may think this to-day, I may not think so tomorrow; and if my opinions change, should I not give credit to another who changes his opinions that he does so from the best possible motives?” It seemed to him that if Unitarians adopted a creed, they must endeavour, at every moment, to bring the Scriptures and their knowledge to prove that creed, instead of allowing their creed to take care of itself, and be the result of their knowledge; and therefore he felt quite convinced that if Unitarians were to

remain the charitable sect they were, they must avoid committing themselves to any particular form of religious belief. That they were a charitable sect, he believed no one would deny. They had asserted this to-night, and he assured them he had the same opinion. The little incident he would relate proved, as he thought, that they were a charitable body. Some few years ago it was thought desirable to establish in the village a parish school, in addition to the one that existed at the Mill, which was perfectly right. On that occasion, when they came to establish the school, as this meeting knew, they opened a crusade against the Unitarians, and brought a number of their ministers from St. Bees to preach against the particular doctrines advocated in this place of worship, and which, they said, were incorrect, and were taught in the school. Now, from the establishment of the school in this place till the present day, they had most scrupulously avoided the giving of any religious instruction, because here Protestants, Catholics and Dissenters of all kinds had their children educated together, and it was thought that was the best way of teaching them charity towards each other; and besides, they felt convinced that if universal charity was established, they would have a greater number of scholars, and therefore, with a large school, they would be able to obtain a better master than they would if they took to inculcating a particular creed. As he had said, those people came and preached against the school. It annoyed him most certainly—it annoyed him very much; not that he so much cared that they misrepresented his opinions as a religionist, but that they were taking the bread out of the mouth of a most honest, praiseworthy, industrious, respectable and right-hearted man, Mr. Black. The result of that crusade was that Mr. B.'s school fell off to one-half. It was with the greatest distress that he (Mr. A.) looked upon this. He felt so much about it, indeed, that his charity really gave way; and he wrote to the Chairman of the Committee for appointing the ministers for these services, telling him the circumstances, and asking if he did not think it desirable that they should begin to preach a set of doctrinal sermons—which had never been preached here and never contemplated—to disprove the assertions made against them. His reply was just what a Christian minister might have been expected to give. It was this: “If they smite thee on the one cheek, turn to them the other also. You can live down the accusations against yourself. Mr. Black can teach down the accusations against him.” Mr. Black proceeded on that prin-

ciple. They knew the result. The school was now in a more flourishing condition than it was ever in before; and he was glad to say that the persons against whom those accusations had been brought, had been enabled not only to live them down, but, by their good conduct and strong good sense, to bring peace into a parish which had been in so excited a state. Unitarians were accused, they were aware, of one thing—that they wished a revision of the Scriptures. They certainly did, because they believed that since the Scriptures were translated, a very large amount of new knowledge had come into the world—a much greater amount of scholarship existed than did at the time of the translation—and therefore they believed a better version could be given than they possessed at present. A new version was not contemplated just now by the Legislature; but Unitarians were very much in the habit of carrying it out for themselves in this way, which was what they did in his (Mr. A.'s) own family, viz., they took different versions of the Scripture to public worship, such as the Greek and Latin Testaments, the French, German or English Bibles; and he could not tell them the advantage derived; for, with these in their hands, very frequently a passage or word that would otherwise have been carelessly passed by came before them in another light. Now they only wanted the uneducated to have every benefit which they, as educated people, enjoyed—of seeing the Scriptures brought home to them in all the different lights and bearings they were capable of. And perhaps some persons here assembled would allow him to say one word to them on this subject. He knew that some young men here present had learnt French that they might be able to read the French mathematicians. He would recommend them to adopt the course he had stated his family adopted—to take a French instead of an English Bible with them to this room, or to church, if they went there. They would thereby have a twofold advantage—that of two versions of the Scripture read, so that two or three ideas might come home to them instead of one; and even, presuming that they got no religious benefit from it, it would still improve their knowledge of the French language. So that, as he said before, nothing in this life—whatever they did—but should be turned to account in a religious way. If they only brought all they could to bear on their religious life, they would soon be a very different nation from what they were at the present time.—Now, he had run through a very long tale, and very likely had tired them very much; but he

thought, from the way in which they had brought this testimonial before him, that he ought not to lose the opportunity of saying these things for their mutual benefit; and in conclusion, he would close with the prayer of a German poet, "Light—light—more light!" Get information wherever they could—get light wherever they could—bring it always to bear not only on their life in this world, but on what they hoped their life might be in the world to come. And he would say this, that with all the light they could ever manage to get, they could never get more than in the study of the life of Jesus Christ. They would there find that as he came out from the Father, he only knew the Father. They would also find that all the light they could now get would give them no more than he had, for he knew what was in man. He would conclude with the same prayer for them that he offered for himself, and that was, that they might never be afraid to get new knowledge—to get "more light"—only adding, that he felt perfectly convinced that all the light they could ever get would never give them a knowledge of the Almighty and a knowledge of man at variance with what they could receive from the Sacred Volume they had this night placed on the table. (Applause.)

After a short interval, Mr. AINSWORTH again rose, and, advertiring to the school under Mr. Black's care, said that some twelve months ago he was very anxious to know whether it was really as great a benefit to the place or not as he supposed, and for that purpose he put himself in communication with people who ought to know something about it. There was one man in the parish of whom he thought very highly—he thought he did a great deal of good—it was John Gowan; and meeting him one day he (Mr. A.) remarked that he thought the parish was a great deal improved. "Yes," he replied, "I quite agree with you. Mr. Black has been teaching here now for ten years, and nothing stands still in God's world, not even a man's religion." He (Mr. A.) thought that a great deal for a Methodist to say, and thought that if some good had come out of Mr. Black's teaching here, John Gowan was the man to know it. For his own part he felt, individually, very much indebted to Mr. Black. The education of his boys had been partly at home and partly away; and anything Mr. Black had done for them here had been right well done. As far as their mathematical knowledge went, they had stood the test elsewhere. Now, this was a great thing to say; for a sound education embraced the most that a father could do for his chil-

dren. As to leaving a child money, if he did not get education, so as to let him know how to use it, it would be better for him that he should not have money, for he would then only make a fool of himself, and perhaps worse. But give him a sound education, and they put all that a father could put within his reach. He went out into the world, and if true to himself would rise in the world. If a father did this faithfully, he would not be disappointed; and when he came to be an old man and stood in need of assistance, his child would render it. Now, they were much indebted to Mr. Black; and when he (Mr. A.) spoke before of his having to stand an attack made upon him in the parish, he did not tell them how he was really regarded by the very persons who had assailed him. Very shortly afterwards, some of them sent their sons to be instructed in mathematics by him. Now, he had an opportunity some time ago of saying to those very persons who had assailed Mr. B. here, "Why, gentlemen, it is not fair—you have no right to speak ill of Mr. Black, and then send your children to him. If he is a bad man, why send them?" They said, "O! that is past—say nothing about it." He replied, "If he is a bad man, hold him as such, and don't send your children." "O! but," said they, "we want them to be good mathematicians." "Then," he rejoined, "you must take Mr. Black as he is—not revile his religion and take his mathematics." He believed that, even after one of those young men had come home from Cambridge or Oxford, he wished to go under Mr. Black's tuition again; but Mr. Black declined, saying, "No, I have my own duties to perform. I am now under Government inspection, and it is expected that I do my own work thoroughly." He thought they were all very much indebted to Mr. Black. He was a blessing to the parish. Other parishes thought the same thing; they would not send their children to him to be educated from Egremont, Kinniside, and other parishes, if they did not think he was the best teacher in the district. He did not know they could do any more than wish him success in his occupation as a teacher; and might he reap the benefit he (Mr. A.) was sure he deserved. His son was now going up for his examination in London. Mr. Scoltock, the Inspector, said to him when he was here, "Well, if you don't get a Queen's scholarship, I'll hang you" (A laugh.) He hoped he would obtain it. It would enable Mr. Black to get more pupil-teachers, and see his name flourish in the public prints as having brought out some of the Queen's scholars. He wished

him all success; and could not have departed without saying so much; for he thought it was only Mr. Black's due. (Applause.)

Mr. BLACK, in replying, said he was very unworthy of much that Mr. Ainsworth had so kindly said of him. It was now thirteen years since he came to this place, and he had certainly endeavoured to do his duty as far as he was able; but still he knew he had had many shortcomings, and many a man in his place would have done two or three times more than he had. In reference to the attacks that had been made upon him, and of which Mr. Ainsworth had spoken, he had never interfered to teach the children entrusted to him religion—far from it—although he had certainly, in his instructions, endeavoured to impart to them some moral conceptions. Religion, however, was not the word to apply to these, for they comprised nothing like any particular creed. His own religious belief was Unitarian, and before he sat down he would take occasion to offer a remark personal to himself. It had been hinted at by certain parties that his religious opinions had changed since he came to this place. Now, he might state that before he left his own country, for at least two or three years, his opinions had begun to change. Like most persons in general brought up in very strict Presbyterian fashion, he had believed that the Presbyterian form of religion was the right form, and that every other was very far wrong; but he happened, when in Glasgow, to see placards in the streets announcing a lecture on Slavery by Dr. Channing, one of the most eminent of Unitarian divines and a sincere Christian. He purchased and read it, and shortly after purchased his works, which he perused, and was soon led out of his own infallibility. His opinions were quite shaken when he came here, and he did not know that he could have found his way out if he had not come. He was, therefore, particularly indebted to Mr. Ainsworth for the opportunities of instruction he had here received. In conclusion, he avowed the difficulty he had in making a speech; for though it was true he was on his legs, yet most certainly he was off his feet. (Laughter.)

Mr. WM. MEEK, manager of the Mill, proposed a vote of thanks to Mr. Ainsworth for the excellent address he had given them. The motion was carried by acclamation.

Mr. AINSWORTH returned thanks, and said that though this was the first social meeting of the kind that they had had, yet he hoped it would not be the last, and that they would know one another better than before they met. One thing he would

advert to before parting. It had dwelt very much on his mind at home, though Mrs. Ainsworth and he did not see it quite in the same light. He felt there was a want in this district of education in religious thinking—religious principle. This could only be given in early life; and as Mr. Black's was not a religious school, it had occurred to him that something else should be done to supply the deficiency. Mrs. Ainsworth and he had been visiting a friend in Derbyshire the other day, and the impression he referred to had come strongly upon him when he saw what his friend, Mr. M'Connel, was doing for his district. He felt ashamed of himself when he thought of home, and that he ought to do something more than he had yet done. Now, he would tell them what was his practice with his own children. In a place of public worship, it required all the attention of elderly people to enable them to follow the clergyman's discourse, if that clergyman was capable of dealing with his subject. It was quite impossible for children to derive any benefit there, and it was desirable, therefore, that they should remain away. His object had been to keep his children from coming to the schoolroom services; but so true was it that they would imitate what their parents did, that the difficulty had been to keep them from coming with them. His audience, and particularly those from Scotland, knew that, in general, this plan was reversed. People took little children to places of worship, very frequently to the annoyance of the children as much as that of the more elderly people; and the consequence was, that the children often got disgusted with the very religion they ought to like. He would not, according to the plan he proposed to adopt, take away the children from the Sunday-schools already in existence. If they were getting spiritual knowledge there, he should wish them to remain there; but the kind of Sunday-school he should wish to establish—and it would require a sacrifice on his part, for he liked the Sunday for his own private reading, still he felt he could do something more for the people of this district—the kind of Sunday-school he should wish to establish was not one where children should go to learn reading and writing. They should be thoroughly instructed in these elementaries ere they came to the kind of school he wished to see established. He would take no child under thirteen years of age, and those whom he did take might remain as long as they pleased. His object would be to teach them how they were constituted—why they were sent into this world, and what they had to do in it, &c.—to give

them, in fact, that sort of religious knowledge which men and women of ripe years ought to have. He had thought about this, and spoken about it, until sometimes he was distressed, for he did not yet clearly see his way to carrying it out, and he never liked to commence a thing which he was not sure of carrying out to some good result. They must give him a little more time to think of it, and then, when he saw his way satisfactorily, if there were any children not younger than thirteen, or above that age, who could read, and if they came here, now that these Bibles had been presented, three Sundays out of four—for he must reserve one in four for the education of himself—he thought he would be able to give them some knowledge of what religion was, and of their duty to God and man. It would be in the spirit of love. It would be to teach them that they must look to God as their Heavenly Father—to teach them to love their neighbour, their brothers, their sisters, their fathers, their mothers—to endeavour to check and curb all bad passions and resist all temptation to do evil—in fact, it would be a moral school as far as he could make it so. He had spoken on the subject to Mr. Black, who said he would be very glad when he (Mr. A.) was absent to take charge of the class. He thought young men might derive great advantage from such a class, for in fact it would be an infant church, preparatory to their joining the larger church or congregation here. He would only have the class on one part of the day. It seemed to him that the best time would be to begin at half-past ten or eleven o'clock, and to remain during the hours of morning service; but the afternoon he must reserve for his own spiritual instruction. He should be very glad to have the opinion of any father or friend present. During the next six months, a gentleman—a nephew of Dr. Channing—would preach here, whose sermons in the afternoon were always addressed to children. Those addresses, he could tell every one present, were the most beautiful he had ever heard in his life; and if parents came with their children they would benefit by them. He had given them his idea of a Sunday-school. It was to him painful to see little children dragged through the streets and put upon uncomfortable benches, to get disgusted with religion, instead of being pleased with it and taught to look upon it as a reasonable service. With this expression of his views, he committed his idea to the consideration of those present, for they had far more influence than he; they could come across men in a way which he could not; and it had always been said of a

Unitarian chapel that it had more hats than bonnets in it, because generally they were attended by more men than women. But the men who attended them were men of great influence in their respective districts, who had the control of other men—persons in higher positions in society; and therefore they had greater power for the spread of good than he himself. He had attempted to do good to the people in this parish; those here present had been kind enough this evening to acknowledge the benefit. He wished to shew them that they were able, in their turn, to confer benefit on those who were below them. In talking together of these matters, if anything occurred to them which they thought might be worked out to their mutual benefit—anything tending to raise them or their fellow-creatures in the scale of civilized life—nothing would give him greater pleasure than to confer with them at any time and in any way they pleased, so that they might really and truly bring about such emulation as would provoke each other unto good works, and stimulate them to shew, by their example, that they were sincerely impressed by the doctrines they taught. His children must grow up with their children, and each, with that example before them, would be a blessing to them in after years. Another thing: he found that the gentleman he had lately visited, Mr. M'Connel, when he could not have a clergyman, read a sermon to the people in his district. When those here did not attend their own services, they might be able to do something for each other in that way. If they thought he could be of any help to them, he could promise to give them in the morning, through the Sunday-school, an hour and a half or two hours of a small religious service. He left the matter entirely in their hands. He had only now to say that this had been a pleasant night to him. He was very much obliged to them for their visit this evening, and particularly for the present that stood before him. He prayed God's blessing might rest upon them all, in their different positions.

Mr. BLACK stated that the subscription amounted to £5. 16s., and after paying for the Bibles a balance of £1. 7s. remained. It was for the meeting to say how it should be disposed of.

Mr. DALZELL suggested that it should be kept for the use of the Sunday-school contemplated by Mr. Ainsworth.

Mr. AINSWORTH thought the suggestion a good one, and said that, if the school were established, the money might be laid out in the purchase of a little Service-book—a kind of Liturgy—taken partly from

the Church service and partly from others—and which would be very useful indeed.

It was agreed that the balance should be reserved by Mr. Black, as treasurer, for the purchase of books for the Sunday class; and, if not required for that purpose, to be disposed of as otherwise the subscribers may direct.

Mr. WILSON suggested that a small motto or memorial be inscribed on the Bibles, indicating why and by whom they had been presented.

Mr. AINSWORTH requested to be allowed to do that, it being his purpose to have a list of all the contributors printed, and a copy inserted in every volume.

The speeches were delightfully relieved by songs and duets sung by Mr. and Mrs. Ainsworth and several of the party, Mr. Ainsworth accompanying the pieces on the harmonium. Prints and an excellent stereoscope, with plates, were upon the table, and the kind host and hostess vied with each other in attending to their guests and making one and all feel at home. The proceedings were closed with an "Evening Hymn," sung in parts.

THE MATTHEW HENRY TESTIMONIAL.

Since the publication of our last No. some additional steps have been taken in reference to this matter, to which we willingly give publicity. The congregation of Crook-Street chapel—Matthew Henry's chapel—Chester, being excluded, amongst other Unitarians, from taking part in the movement by the terms of the first resolution passed at the public meeting, it was felt that some public notice should be taken of such bigotry, and some rebuke administered on the spot. Accordingly on Sunday, Nov. 28th, two discourses were delivered in Crook-Street chapel by the Rev. S. F. Macdonald on "Matthew Henry and the English Presbyterians." The audience in the morning was numerous and respectable; in the evening the chapel was crowded to excess. We subjoin a brief outline of the sermons on the occasion. The text was from Acts xxiv. 14. After shewing that most religious reformers had been stigmatized as "heretics" when they dared to depart from the old traditions and corrupt ways of the world, and that such departure implied no disgrace, but often indicated high wisdom and courage, the preacher proceeded to trace the origin of the Non-conformist body from the notorious "Act of Uniformity" passed in 1662. In consequence of this Act, 2000 ministers quitted the Church—a piece of arch tyranny on the one hand, and of noble sacrifice on the other, almost unparalleled in history.

Philip Henry, the father of Matthew, was one of this glorious roll of names. He retired from the living of Worthenbury, Flintshire, to Broad Oak, where Matthew Henry was born that same year. Several interesting circumstances were mentioned respecting the early life of Matthew—his early promise of genius, his application to study, his seriousness and sweetness of disposition, his education at home in the happy circle of Broad Oak, his devotion to the ministry, his visits to London, and his settlement at Chester in 1687. Here for twenty-five years he preached, prayed and expounded; and if ever there was a faithful and untiring labourer in the vineyard of the Lord, Matthew Henry was that one. His influence in the town rose higher and higher every year, the simple worth and beauty of his character attracting the esteem and affection not only of his own flock, but of all who knew him. His learning and labours were in every sense extraordinary, and he may be truly said to have cast a pure and blessed influence around him on every side. He left Chester for Hackney in 1712, and two years later, while on a visit to his old flock, was thrown from his horse near Nantwich, where he died, June, 1714. The preacher specially referred to two features in Matthew Henry's character—the eminently clear and practical bent of his mind, and the gentleness and catholicity of his spirit. There was no doubt that he was a Trinitarian, but evidently of a mild type; he was anything but a narrow or bigoted one. Out of more than 500 sermons, the titles or heads of which are set down in his diary, only one had special reference to the doctrine of the Trinity. The whole strain and drift of his mind was against doctrinal and controversial preaching; his sermons were simple, direct, practical. Several extracts were given from his first sermon preached in Crook-Street chapel, Chester, to shew the tolerance and generous breadth of his spirit. We give one as a sample: "From our hearts," says he, "we abhor and renounce all such narrow principles as are contrary to catholic Christianity, and undermine and straiten its sure and large foundations. We do here solemnly profess, and shall take all occasions to repeat, that we celebrate our religious assemblies in communion with all that in every place call on the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours." The preacher then referred to the general history of the English Presbyterian body, and Matthew Henry's connection with Crook-Street chapel. The bond of union amongst them was not a form of church government, as might be supposed from the name, nor was

it a creed or doctrinal statement. The bond of union of the English Presbyterians consisted of two principles—1st, the sufficiency of Scripture; 2nd, the right of private judgment. By the first, they abjured all human creeds or statements of belief *extra* to the Bible; by the second, they fearlessly upheld the right of interpreting the sacred volume for themselves. In 1700, Crook-Street chapel was built for Matthew Henry, who preached in it for twelve years. His successor was Mr. Gardner, a worthy and respected man, but as little of a doctrinal preacher as Matthew Henry had been. In the time of Mr. Gardner, a secession took place, as some members did not find him Calvinistic enough; these went and formed a separate congregation, which is now represented by the society of Christians assembling in the Independent chapel, Queen Street, Chester. They laid down a doctrinal creed as their basis, a belief in the Trinity, &c.; but there was no creed expressed in the foundation of Crook-Street chapel. This society retained its original principles of non-subscription to human creeds and the Protestant right of private judgment. The minister was not compelled to teach nor the people to believe according to a certain fixed standard, but they were left free to think and to worship according to their own highest convictions. Reference was then made to the doctrinal change that had passed over the English Presbyterians within the last century and a half. They had advanced from the creed of John Calvin to that of Dr. Channing. Many ingenious theories had been set up to account for this change—“lapse,” as it was sometimes called; unfortunately, they all missed the mark; the true reason was a very simple one. The English Presbyterians were the only body that had been set free to study the Scriptures for themselves. All other religious bodies had tied themselves down to certain fixed standards, from which they dared not move. The Independents had done so, the Baptists, the Wesleyans, the Presbyterians of Scotland, and of course the Church of England; the Presbyterians of England alone were free to investigate the sacred volume for themselves, to hold and to teach what they found there without fear of consequences. The result has been that they have become Unitarians. Such is the reason of the change; it is a simple consequence of the free and reverent study of the Bible. What other or better proof could be given that Unitarianism is the real, natural, common-sense meaning of the Scriptures? The discourse was concluded in the following terms: “We have now placed before

you the life of two great and good men, Philip and Matthew Henry. We have traced, however briefly and imperfectly, the history of the religious body with which they were more immediately connected. That body has changed its *opinions*, but not, I trust, its *spirit*. That body in its essential principles remains the same, and claims its descent from such pure and noble-minded men, whatever may be said to the contrary. It has recently been laid down by an authority in this town, that unless you agree to all a man’s views, you cannot venerate his character; that unless you are prepared to endorse his opinions, you have no right to honour his memory. Such a principle as this would, we fear, confine our love and regard to very narrow bounds. Happily we can afford to smile at such petty exclusiveness, such miserable bigotry. It has never been the practice of *our* body thus to limit its sympathy or its admiration. We have always refused to confine our veneration to the shallow limits of sect and party, and have sought after that larger and deeper spirit of charity which sees excellence in pales beyond its own, which rejoices in truth and goodness wherever found. But the fact is, Philip and Matthew Henry are peculiarly our own; we will yield them up to none; and we have no hesitation in saying, that if they were alive now, they would be the foremost to denounce such narrowness and intolerance as have been exhibited in this city within the last few weeks. If we have proved anything at all, if we have substantiated any proposition respecting them, it surely is that they were wise, pure, loving, large-hearted men, to be venerated on account of the nobleness and elevation of their minds, the saintly beauty of their characters, the practical usefulness and devotion of their lives, and not for the poor and pitiful reason that they believed in the Athanasian Creed! Let those who wish, honour Matthew Henry as an “orthodox commentator;” but we at least desire to cherish his name as that of a saint and hero of the church universal.”

This remonstrance, we believe, was not wholly without effect. Meantime, another fact became alarmingly evident. By the exclusion of those who were supposed not to hold “orthodox views as to the divine mission of Christ the Head,” it was found that a large number of people were shut out who would have proved the most zealous and effective supporters of the object in question. The subscriptions came in very slowly, and this circumstance began to open the eyes, if not to liberalize the sentiments, of these exclusive gentlemen. They became at length awake to the fact

that the Unitarians would not subscribe their money unless they were allowed to take their proper share in the management of the fund, and to come quite as prominently forward as their self-styled "orthodox" brethren. Many Churchmen also, and others who had no particular sympathy with Unitarian opinions, were disgusted with the illiberality of the proceedings, and refused to countenance them in any way. We are further informed that a great number of letters were received by the Committee entrusted to carry out the arrangements, expressing dissatisfaction, pointing to the obnoxious clause, and demanding the reason for the absurd limitation. Under these circumstances, the hon. Member for Chester, Mr. Salisbury, published a letter in the *Chester Chronicle*, in which, after professing sentiments of the utmost liberality, and declaring his admiration for the names of Martineau and Channing, he says that, for his own part, he very much regrets that the Unitarians find themselves excluded, but that it certainly was not intended, and he still hopes they may accept the terms of the first resolution. To this statement two replies have been given. The first from Mr. Edward Johnson, the Secretary of Crook-Street chapel, who gives a clear and straightforward account of the facts as they occurred. From his statement it appears that two representatives of the Unitarian congregation were specially invited to be present at the preliminary meeting, that they attended accordingly, and, on the first resolution being read, they proposed the omission of the limiting clause, which proposition was at once rejected. Mr. Johnson adds—"I have felt it right to state explicitly what did take place, to shew that in withdrawing from the movement we only acted consistently. I feel assured that this view of the case is taken not only by those in our body, embracing the majority of the descendants of the Henrys, but by all liberal and high-minded Christians who venerate those principles of religious liberty and real toleration which actuated Philip Henry in refusing his assent to the Act of Uniformity, and which his son Matthew so forcibly inculcated by his example and preaching." The second reply comes from the Rev. S. F. Macdonald, whose comment upon these extraordinary proceedings we give in his own words: "It is perfectly true that I stated that I believed in the divine mission of Christ, and held myself to be as 'orthodox' as any gentleman in the room. Neither Mr. Salisbury nor his friends require to be informed (though some of them do occasionally forget) that the word 'orthodox,' in its strict etymological meaning,

signifies the *holding of right or sound opinions*; and as every man believes that he himself holds right or sound opinions, of course orthodoxy really signifies one's own views; heterodoxy, other or different views. But while this is true, it is also certain that in current speech 'orthodox views' mean 'Trinitarian views,' i.e. that scheme of Christian doctrine which recognizes the Trinity as its foundation. The ordinary and popular rendering of the clause in question therefore would be, 'holding Trinitarian views as to the divine mission of Christ the Head'; and it was expressly on this ground that we objected to the clause and formally proposed its being left out. Mr. Salisbury says that he regrets the exclusion of the Unitarians, but adds that it was unintentional, and implies that it could not be helped under the circumstances. There is a curious fact, however, which it is somewhat difficult to reconcile with this hypothesis. On the Committee formed to carry out the proposed objects, I observe upwards of fifty names. And how many of them are Unitarian names? Not one. Yet we have belonging to this religious body in Chester some men of standing, reputation, wealth, intelligence and public spirit, who might naturally expect to be placed on such Committee, and all these are unaccountably passed by. Does this look like accident or design? After all these apologies and explanations, the fact remains, the exclusion is maintained, the obnoxious clause holds its place. When two parties wish to come together, but there is some barrier between them, some unfortunate impediment that stands in the way, what is the natural proceeding? Why, to remove it, of course. The barrier in this case consists of *twelve words*. The remedy, then, is in the hands of those who still keep it up. Erase the words; cast the wretched clause to the four winds of heaven; demolish the partition-wall, and the waters will flow together freely, gladly. But while this interdiction remains on their minute-book, it is impossible for the Unitarians to join in the movement. In conclusion, I must say that I should be extremely sorry to introduce one drop of the *odium theologicum* into this discussion. And for my own part, I am very unwilling to believe that this illiberal proceeding has been initiated by Mr. Salisbury. A man who venerates the names of Martineau and Channing would hardly be guilty of such premeditated intolerance. But I fear he has lent himself to the silly bigotry of others without exercising his usual tact and judgment. Be this as it may, however, having chosen his line of conduct and 'cast in his lot' with those who have acted

with such singular narrowness and short-sightedness, he is of course prepared to take the consequences. I only venture to remind him of the fable of the stork caught among the geese, and bid him beware of bad company.

DORCHESTER ORTHODOXY AND CHARITY.

A "Correspondence between a Dissenting Minister and one of his Congregation" has been recently printed at Dorchester, which, inasmuch as it makes known the sentiments and feelings that exist in the minds of *some* "orthodox" Dissenting ministers respecting Unitarian opinions and worship, claims something more than local notice, and is of interest to all who value the belief in the One God the Father, and in his Son Jesus Christ, whom he has sent.

The correspondence arose out of a very simple circumstance. In the course of last summer, the Rev. Francis Bishop, who is well known to our readers, visited Dorchester, his native town, and during his stay there resided in the house of his brother-in-law, Mr. Froud, who was a member and one of the deacons of the Baptist church at Dorchester, of which church the Rev. Frederick Perkins is the minister. When at Dorchester, Mr. Bishop preached at the Unitarian chapel, and at the morning service Mr. Froud went to hear him, attending the same day twice at his own place of worship. The following day the Rev. Frederick Perkins addressed a letter of remonstrance to his deacon, Mr. Froud, calling him to account "for going to the Unitarian chapel, and joining them in what they believe to be the worship of God,"—stating also that by so doing he had been "guilty of idolatry." The writer peremptorily demanded of Mr. Froud whether it was "his intention to join in Unitarian worship again," and intimated that he should "bring the matter before the church." Mr. Froud, evidently much astonished at this strange communication and the unchristian spirit it manifested, appears to have suppressed his feelings, and addressed a friendly note to his inquisitorial pastor, expressing his regret that he, Mr. Perkins, should have made such an unjustifiable demand; that in so doing "he had allowed his creed to get the better of his Christianity," and also expressing the hope that for the sake of peace, and upon maturer consideration, he would himself see that he was pursuing a wrong course. This note, however, appears to have had no other effect than to stimulate the bigotry of the irate minister. The demand upon Mr. Froud that he would promise not to attend Unitarian worship

again, was urged in a more insulting manner, which promise Mr. Froud at once and positively declined to make, at the same time strenuously denying the right of his minister to put the question, or to endeavour to exact such a promise. The Rev. *Frederick Perkins*, in his succeeding letters, does not say much as to the fact of his refractory deacon attending at the Unitarian chapel; his remarks consist of coarse and vulgar attacks upon Unitarian opinions. An intense bigotry pervades them. They are unreasoning and unscholarly, disjointed and rambling, and remind us of the style and arguments of a schoolboy theologian with whom the writer, more than forty years ago, had a theological controversy, when both combatants ought to have been studying Euclid. The Rev. *Frederick Perkins* assumes the position of an infallible interpreter of sacred truth. He is the sovereign oracle, from whose judgment no appeal is to be made or can be needed. He tells us that "Unitarian chapels are not sanctuaries of God," that "among the apostles on earth, and saints in glory, I find no worship like Unitarian worship." "The object of Unitarian worship is only an imaginary God." "Our Lord bid us beware of Unitarian leaven." "I am astonished that Unitarians do not see that Christ is to be worshiped as God. Pliny the younger did." "Unitarians belong to the family of infidel Deists." "There is a sympathy between them and Mahomet, and we see how good these Mahomedan Unitarians are in India now." He speaks disparagingly of our revered fathers and confessors in the faith, and says of Dr. Priestley, that "he slurs the matter (the Trinity) over in a wily manner," and that "his wicked perversity was seen by the Lord." He says that Unitarians are in general "a prayerless, godless class of characters;" that "the spawn of Unitarianism is infidelity;" and, as a climax to this wild rhapsody, the Rev. *Frederick Perkins* says, "I never expect to meet an intelligent Unitarian in heaven." The effect of these strange letters, "so full of the worst spirit of Popery," as Mr. Froud very justly describes them, was the withdrawal of the latter from the church of which he had been a member very many years, telling his assailant at the same time that, if he was disposed to acknowledge any man's infallibility, he would at once go to Rome.

Considered apart from the circumstance which called them forth, these letters of a blind zealot are of no importance. In themselves they are in truth utterly unworthy of serious notice. Looking at them in one point of view they seem like

the utterances of a fiery partisan of the fourteenth century, suddenly aroused from his fossil condition, and temporarily endowed with the capacity of pouring forth the effete ideas of that by-gone time into the midst of the advanced Christian knowledge and liberality of the nineteenth century. But there is another way of looking at such outpourings of narrow-minded bigotry. It cannot be denied that there is a numerous class of persons in orthodox Dissenting churches who trust implicitly to the representations of their minister as to the character and tendency of the Unitarian faith ; and when that faith is so grossly maligned and misrepresented as in the instance before us, it is no longer matter of surprise that ignorance of our opinions and a blind prejudice against them are still fostered and perpetuated amongst a large circle of persons who *really* know nothing of their true character. This is probably the case with some members of the church over which the *Rev. Frederick Perkins* presides. We have heard of well-meaning but imperfectly-informed members of that church, who have said they did not know Unitarian opinions were so bad until they read these statements of their minister. But we must also state that this applies only to a portion of the people. There are others who are better informed, and who will not pin their faith to such a caricature of our opinions. We have taken some pains to ascertain the effect of Mr. Perkins's letters on the minds of persons of other denominations at Dorchester, and, so far as we can learn, thoughtful members of other churches impugn the accuracy and condemn the spirit of the letters. It is possible ; nay, we have been told that this warm champion of orthodoxy himself now regrets the course which he pursued in this matter ; we have also reason to believe that he has received friendly remonstrances from more liberal and influential persons than himself in his own denomination. Mr. Perkins came from Aberdeen to Dorchester about four months before the occurrence,—it may be bringing with him a goodly share of the cold, hard theology which is said to prevail there ; possibly the more genial atmosphere of the "sunny South" has tended to relax in some slight measure the stony heart of rigid Calvinism. Certain it is that such petty acts of priestly despotism enable us to see more clearly the value of, and to cherish with deeper attachment, that intellectual freedom which is the foundation-principle of our own churches. We trust that such will be the effect of this insidious attack upon their opinions upon the minds of the members of the little church at Dorchester. We

fear the time is yet very remote when we shall no longer need to defend our opinions from the misrepresentations and misconceptions of other sects. We hear that the *Rev. W. James*, of Bristol, the Secretary of the Western Unitarian Christian Union, immediately on the publication of the "Correspondence," suggested the delivery of a course of lectures at Dorchester to illustrate and defend Unitarian opinions, and accordingly the Committee of that Society promptly undertook to carry out the arrangement. The lectures are to be delivered on six following Sundays early in the year. The effect of the lectures, we have no doubt, will be such as to encourage and strengthen the hands of the Dorchester congregation ; and we think they will also tend to counteract the prejudices and misconception arising from Mr. Perkins's letters.

PORTRAIT OF THE LATE MR. WELLBELOVED.

It will gratify the friends of this excellent man, recently taken from amongst us, to learn that there is a prospect of their being put in possession of an Engraving from the only portrait of him in existence. The picture was painted many years ago by Lonsdale, at the request of the late *Mr. G. W. Wood*. It was a condition that no engraving should be taken from it during Mr. Wellbeloved's life. The picture is now at Singleton, near Manchester, and is the property of *Mr. W. Rayner Wood*. His consent has been sought to a proposal to engrave the portrait, as a fitting completion of the Testimonial of respect offered during his life-time by the students of York College to their revered Principal. In how generous a spirit Mr. Wood meets the request will be best seen from the correspondence which follows.

"To William Rayner Wood, Esq.

"Dear Sir,—The death of our venerated Tutor, the *Rev. Charles Wellbeloved*, naturally makes us desirous of completing the Testimonial of respect offered to him during his life (in effecting which you took a leading part), by procuring an Engraving of the admirable Portrait of him in your possession.

"We therefore unite in respectfully asking your permission to have an Engraving taken from the Picture, and in soliciting your co-operation with us, and such others of the York Students as may be willing to join us, in having it executed in a manner that will do justice to the subject, and gratify the feelings of his mourning Family.

"We subscribe ourselves, &c., &c.,

"MARK PHILIPS,

"THOMAS MADGE,"

&c., &c.

The request received the signature of many others, formerly students at York, both laymen and divines.

“Singleton, Manchester, Dec. 12, 1858.

“Gentlemen,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your request that I will place the Portrait of Mr. Wellbeloved at your disposal for the purpose of being engraved, and to assure you that I shall have the greatest pleasure in doing so, the only condition I feel called upon to make being one upon which I am sure your feeling will be the same as my own, that the engraving should be executed in a style worthy of the object.

“I trust that my part in the matter need not be limited to a compliance with your request, and that I may be allowed to co-operate with you by offering my own contribution towards the accomplishment of the object, of any sum which may be needed, not exceeding £50.

“I remain, Gentlemen, faithfully yours,

“W.M. RAYNER WOOD.

“To Mark Philips, Esq., Rev. Thomas Madge, and the other gentlemen who have signed the requisition.”

It will be seen by an advertisement on the cover of our Magazine that a meeting of York students is to be held at Manchester next month to carry the plan into execution.

PRESENTATION TO THE REV. J. CROPPER
AT STAND.

The teachers and scholars of Stand chapel Sunday-school presented, on Saturday evening, to their esteemed minister, the Rev. J. Cropper, M.A., a beautiful Silver Ink-stand, of very tasteful design, bearing the following inscription:

“Presented to the Rev. J. CROPPER, by the Teachers and Scholars of Stand Chapel Sunday School, as a tribute of gratitude for the disinterested zeal with which he has long laboured for their welfare. Stand, December 18th, 1858.”

During the evening several of the Teachers spoke of the benefits they had received from their connection with the school and chapel, and of the parental influence exercised over them in their training as scholars in the school by the Rev. gentleman and his lady.

UNITARIAN MEETINGS IN LONDON.

Some interesting and we hope useful meetings have been lately held in London and the vicinity, concerning which we are precluded by our limited space from doing more than briefly describing their nature and objects.

On Nov. 24, the *London District Unitarian Society* held a Soirée at Radley's Hotel, at which there was a large attendance of both ministers and the laity. The subject for discussion was the somewhat delicate one, “Does the Pulpit in the Unitarian Church exercise its legitimate influence?” The subject was well introduced by Mr. J. C. Lawrence, who, together with several lay speakers who followed, answered the question in the negative, and gave reasons for this, some depending on the state of popular opinion, others on defects and neglects in our own body. There was much plain speaking on the part of the laity, and no lack of good-temper on the part of the ministers who spoke in defence of their order. Much variety of opinion was manifested both as to the extent and the cure of the evil. The prevailing complaint was of the want of earnestness of manner and of plain-speaking, both as to Christian doctrine and moral practice. The ministers were encouraged to speak from the pulpit their thoughts unreservedly and fearlessly, especially in the shape of fault-finding, and some smart illustrations of the practice were given by some of the laity present. Could they be persuaded sometimes to take the place of their preachers, if some might teach a better way, others might perhaps be taught the need of forbearance in criticising the pulpit efforts of other men.

Under the direction of the same Society, a short course of lectures illustrative of Unitarianism has been delivered at Myddelton Hall, Islington, by Mr. Ierson, Mr. Madge, Mr. Aspland and Dr. Harrison. The attendance has, we believe, been good throughout, and the lectures were listened to with manifest interest. More than once interruptions from “orthodox” hearers indicated their dissatisfaction with the effect being produced by the speakers’ arguments. The general character of the remarks and objections was such as to vindicate the propriety of the course determined on from the first by the promoters of the lectures, not to allow any interruptions or discussion.

Another meeting that well deserves a fuller report than has appeared, was that of the *London Auxiliary Sunday-School Association*. It was presided over in the best possible manner by Rev. Henry Ierson, whose accession to the ranks of Unitarian Christianity is very properly matter of congratulation to our friends in the Metropolis. An able, searching and very faithful report was read by Mr. Wade, which shewed that the schools connected with the Unitarian churches of the Metropolitan district were generally stationary or actu-

ally going back. The causes of the decline were sifted by the speakers with discrimination and sincerity, and appeals were made to rouse the zeal of both ministers and the laity to increased exertion in carrying on the wholesome work of Sunday-school instruction. The impression seemed generally to prevail that the Sunday habits of the working classes in London were not improving, and this was attributed in part to the long hours of labour on the Saturday,

trenching in some cases on the Sabbath. Various remedies for attracting the children of the poor to our schools were suggested. The balance of opinion seemed to preponderate against all appeals directed to the lower motives and selfish instincts, whether of scholars or their parents. The tone of the whole proceedings was creditable to the Society, and must benefit the cause it seeks to promote.

OBITUARY.

Nov. 4, at Chelsea, aged 41, Mr. JAMES MILLINGTON, formerly of Trowbridge, and many years a member and organist of the General Baptist church now meeting at Dockhead.

Nov. 8, aged 87, Mr. J. MILLINGTON, of Trowbridge, father of the late Mr. J. Millington, of Chelsea.

Nov. 8, at Maidstone, aged 69, ANNA, wife of Robert COOPER, Esq., J. P.

The Rev. R. E. B. Maclellan, in the introduction to his sermon on the Sunday after the funeral, thus alluded to the deprivation:—"My Christian friends, within the last fortnight, as you are all aware, we have lost an excellent and valuable member of our small society. We have lost one who, with the completest charity towards those of all other denominations, was an enlightened Nonconformist and a consistent Unitarian. We have lost one who was scrupulous and conscientious in the discharge of her religious duties; always delighting to be present, except when the state of her health forbade, at our meetings for social worship and for the celebration of the Lord's Supper. We have lost one who was not only esteemed wherever she was known, and beloved by a large circle of relatives and kindred, but who had the power, to an unusual extent, of winning to herself long and faithful friendships. We have lost one who was singularly happy in life, and singularly happy in death; the resignation, nay occasionally even the cheerfulness, of whose last hours prove how the simple and scriptural faith she entertained has power to support and to sustain, even on the verge of the grave, and even in the prospect of eternity."

Nov. 21, at Portswood Lawn, Southampton, JOHN HAYS DUNKIN, Esq., aged 83. He was born in London and brought

up among the Independents, but was for many years an attendant on the services of the Established Church. About seventeen years since, after hearing a week-evening course of doctrinal lectures at the Unitarian chapel, Newport, by various ministers, he joined the Unitarian congregation there, with whom his family had previously worshiped, and as long as strength permitted was a regular attendant on the ministry of his son-in-law, the Rev. Edmund Kell.

Nov. 25, at her brother-in-law's, Mr. S. Merrick, South Street, Chichester, Miss MARTHA DAWES.

Nov. 25, in the 87th year of her age, SARA, widow of the late Rev. Robert ASPLAND, of Hackney. This venerable lady, whose life was spared so many years, was the daughter of Mr. John Middleton, of St. Martin's Lane, London. There her early life was passed in the cultivation of literature and the pursuit of religious truth. She early attained to the simple faith and cheerful views on which through life she rested with calm assurance. She assisted and sustained her late husband in his transition period, when hesitating between Calvinism and Unitarianism. Before her marriage, she entered various circles of society among the Dissenters of the metropolis, and also among persons devoted to literature and the fine arts. Miss Benger and Jane and Anna Maria Porter, women equally amiable and gifted, were among her literary friends. On her marriage she removed with her husband to the Isle of Wight, and enjoyed several happy years at Newport. Subsequently she passed nearly forty years at Hackney, devoting herself to bringing up a large family, and to the various duties, taxing in no light degree both head and heart, that devolve on the pastor's wife. She was the friend, always both kind and sincere, of all the members

of her husband's flock. To the poorer members she was especially kind, and her memory, notwithstanding years of absence, is still cherished with affection by some persons of this class. After her husband's death, she fixed her home in the house of her eldest daughter, first at Leicester, then at Birkenhead, and latterly at Chester, where, accompanied and affectionately tended by a sister, she received during years of blindness and decline unceasing tokens of that love and reverence which she had so well earned by a life of fidelity to duty, and of sisterly, conjugal and motherly tenderness. To the latest year of her life she was, notwithstanding some privations in her lot, always cheerful, and found her chief happiness in wishing and devising good to others. Her remains were deposited in the family vault at Hackney by the side of her husband. She was followed to the grave by a brother, her five sons, by sons-in-law, and by grandchildren. *Her children rise up and call her blessed.*

Dec. 1, at Park Lane, near Wigan, aged 17 years, JOHN, son of the Rev. James BAYLEY.

Dec. 7, at his residence at Epsom, the Rev. DAVID DAVISON, formerly minister of the Old Jewry chapel, Jewin Street, London, in the 64th year of his age.

The Rev. D. Davison, whose name has been well known in connection with the Unitarian body in London for many years past, was descended from a respectable Scotch family, who settled in the North of Ireland at the plantation of Ulster. He was the son of Mr. William Davison, who farmed the townland of Ballystockart, between Belfast and Comber, and was born April 5th, 1795. Mr. Davison's family consisted besides of a son (who died young) and three daughters, one of whom survives. His son who is the subject of the present sketch was early destined for the ministry; received his early instruction from Mr. Alexander, of Crumlin, who was at that time the best teacher in the neighbourhood; and then proceeded to Glasgow in his 15th year. Here he passed through the usual course of study, and took his degree of M.A. in the year 1815. He was then licensed as a probationer by the Presbytery of Antrim; and after three years was ordained to his first pulpit at Dundalk, in the county of Louth, then in connection with the Synod of Ulster, in 1818, being at the time 23 years of age. He remained at Dundalk about seven years: the congregation appears to have gradually adopted his views in matters of

opinion, which were Arian, and he gained for himself during this period the respect and esteem of all classes, Catholic as well as Protestant. It is interesting to remember that the then Vicar of Dundalk, the Rev. Elias Thackeray, was his intimate friend; that he was on terms of similar intimacy with the Catholic priest; and that Catholic prisoners in the gaol were frequently known to request his ministrations in the temporary absence of their own spiritual adviser. Here he married, in 1821, the only daughter of Samuel Coulter, of Carneg, Esq., and the sister of the late Dr. Thomas Coulter, afterwards Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, distinguished for his botanical researches and collections in California. An accidental visit to London, in 1824, introduced Mr. Davison to the acquaintance of the Rev. Dr. Abraham Rees, of Jewin Street, and led to his preaching in his pulpit. Dr. Rees was pleased with his pulpit services and with his Arian views, which were becoming less common in England; and the result was a correspondence with Mr. John Bentley, then and long afterwards a very active member of the congregation, which led to an invitation to accept the office of assistant pastor to Dr. Rees. This was after some consideration accepted; and Mr. Davison removed to England in the spring of 1825. The general feeling of respect for his personal and ministerial character, and of regret at his departure, found expression in a handsome testimonial, to which all classes contributed, and the inscription on which was written by Mr. Thackeray. In the summer of the year in which he removed to London (June), Dr. Rees died; and in July, 1825, Mr. Davison was unanimously chosen to succeed him as minister of the Old Jewry chapel.*

Mr. Davison's connection with the Old Jewry chapel continued till 1841. This was the period of his greatest activity; and it is to be feared that the great strain upon all his faculties laid the foundation of the attack from the effects of which he died. During a portion of this time (from April 1828 to June 1837) he had a school at Islington: he was constantly and actively engaged in public and social business connected with his neighbourhood, among which the establishment of the Islington Literary and Scientific Institution may be

* I find from memoranda of Mr. Davison's old and valued friend, the late Abraham Lincolne, Esq., of Highbury Place, now in the possession of the family, that he preached his first sermon as minister of the congregation on the 10th of July, 1825, from Titus iii. 8.

mentioned : he took a prominent part in the management of the Orphan Working School, City Road, and in the discussions which the proceedings of the orthodox managers caused : he was one of the Trustees of Dr. Williams's Library, and, though the youngest, soon took a conspicuous part in the business of the Trusts : he was also a member of the Presbyterian Board, and devoted much time and attention to the educational and charitable duties of that body, especially to Carmarthen College and the schools in North Wales. During this period also he published some sermons, principally funeral sermons, and wrote many pamphlets and articles in the periodical publications of the day.

In the year 1841, his connection with the Old Jewry chapel terminated : the tendency of opinion at the time was not in that direction, and as the older members died, their places were not filled up : in 1841, the chapel was sold, and Mr. Davison went to Germany for the prosecution of his literary work and for the education of his family. During the whole of this period, the community of feeling between himself and his congregation was unceasing : most of his old friends there have preceded him to their rest, but some yet remain ; and their friendship towards himself and his family has been undiminished. It would be invidious to specify any by name : those to whom reference is made will accept the grateful record and confirm the correctness of the statement.

He returned to London in 1845, and from that time to 1851 resumed the occupations which had been interrupted ; substituting for congregational duty literary labours of no small value. To this period are to be referred his translation (from the German) of Professor Schlosser's History of the 18th Century, and his translations (from the French) of the Memoirs of the First Napoleon in St. Helena, by General Count Montholon, and of Athanase Coquerel's work on Vital Christianity.

In 1850, he suffered what was apparently a slight attack of paralysis ; which, however, gradually increased ; not for some time debarring him from attending to his various duties, public and private, which he continued during his residence at Bocking from 1851 to 1855 ; but compelling him in the latter year to remove to Epsom, as he found ever increasing difficulty in taking journeys of any length. From that date he gradually withdrew from all the offices he held ; and almost his last official act may be said to have been his visit to the Carmarthen College Examination in 1856 ; thus evincing his continued interest in that institution, which indeed was one

of the last public matters in his thoughts. From that time his weakness and helplessness gradually increased ; and though all that care and affection could suggest was done for him, it was evident that the vital power was becoming exhausted. For the last few weeks of his life he was in a constant state of drowsy stupor, from which he could be rarely roused. The last change took place the day before his death ; and on Tuesday, between twelve and one o'clock, he passed from this world to a better, almost without a struggle and apparently without suffering of any kind.

There are few men who have devoted more of their time and labour to the promotion of great public benefits than the subject of the present sketch. His name has been till within the last few years constantly before the Unitarian public since his first settlement in London, where he made almost his first public appearance at a dinner given to celebrate the 20th anniversary of the late Rev. R. Aspland's ministry at Hackney. With his brethren in the ministry he was always on good terms ; and his co-operation could always be depended on for any useful work. His services in the cause of education were manifested not merely in his own personal exertions as a schoolmaster, of which his former pupils yet entertain a grateful remembrance, and by which he has secured their esteem and affection, but in the regard and attention he always bestowed on Carmarthen College. There he will long be remembered as one of the best friends of the institution, and one of the kindest and most judicious advisers of the young men ; and it deserves to be noticed in this connection, that from his first visit in company with Dr. A. Rees till 1856, he never failed (except whilst out of England) to be present as one of the deputation from the Presbyterian Board at the triennial (or latterly the annual) examinations of the students. It was to him mainly that it was owing that Carmarthen College was affiliated with the University of London ; and past and present students will long look back with regret to the cessation of his annual visits.

His memory will be affectionately cherished by his family and friends : he has merited of the Unitarian brotherhood that he should not be forgotten in the churches. He was emphatically one who did his work while it was day, mindful of that night which cometh when no man can work ; who, having laboured diligently in his vocation, having borne the burden and heat of the day, is, we hope and trust, entered into that rest which remaineth for the servants of God. "He is entered into his rest,

and his works do follow him." "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

S. C. D.

Dec. 17, at his residence, Richard Street, Cornwall Road, Lambeth, in his 65th year, Mr. WORTON RANDELL, for nearly thirty years one of the deacons of the General Baptist church, formerly in Coles Street, now in Dockhead, Southwark. Mr. Randall was born Nov. 6, 1794, at Chichester, where his parents were members of the General Baptist church, then under the pastoral care of the Rev. Gabriel Watts (now of the Rev. John Hill), and served his apprenticeship as a millwright at Portsmouth, where his most intimate friend was Mr. Thomas Letter Taylor, afterwards minister of the General Baptist church at Billingshurst, Sussex. He remained at Portsmouth several years after his apprenticeship, and married Elizabeth, daughter of Mr. Joseph Mills, of Hitchen, Herts, and granddaughter of the Rev. John Mills, minister of the General Baptist church, St. Thomas's Street, Portsmouth. In 1821, he removed to London, and after working some years at his business, was appointed to take care of the machinery in the printing-office of the Messrs. Clowes. He attended the ministry of Dr. Evans, and afterwards of the Rev. B. Mardon, at Worship Street; but in 1829, on the removal of the afternoon congregation from Worship Street to Trinity Place (and afterward to Coles Street), he became a member of it, and was for many years a most valuable co-operator with the then minister, who, in this brief notice, bears his sorrowing testimony to the sound practical sense, energy and Christian worth of his old and valued friend. After the removal of the church to Dockhead, he was, from distance and increasing infirmity, seldom able to go, and usually attended Stamford Street,

from the minister of which, the Rev. T. L. Marshall, he received, during his illness, exemplary pastoral attention.

The latter years of this good man were clouded with domestic trials, which to one who had ever found his purest happiness in his home circle were peculiarly heavy. In February, 1853, he lost his excellent and affectionate wife, and he never fully recovered this shock: in Nov. 1854, a beloved grandchild; and in March, 1855, his nephew, Mr. Thomas Mills Taylor, of Chatham (who had been to him as a son, and was additionally dear to him as the son of his old friend, the Rev. T. L. Taylor), were taken from him; and the sorrow arising from these painful bereavements was further embittered by other trials. Bowed down by these afflictions, a naturally vigorous constitution gave way; and after a lingering illness, soothed by the watchful and affectionate care of his son and daughter-in-law, and by the kindness of many friends, and borne with exemplary patience, he fell asleep, in the hope of a joyful resurrection to eternal life.

J. C. M.

Dec. 22, at the residence of her father, Joseph Henry Oates, Esq., of Carr House, Leeds, MARY, wife of Joshua BUCKTON, Esq., of Headingley, near Leeds.

At his house at Richmond, Surrey, aged 77, RICHARD TAYLOR, Esq., one of the (now probably extinct) race of learned printers. He was a Liberal in politics, and as a member of the Common Council was a strenuous promoter of general reform. As a literary and scientific man, he took an useful and active part in many societies. He was grandson of the celebrated Dr. John Taylor, of Norwich, and was steady in his Nonconformity and Unitarianism.

MARRIAGES.

Nov. 15, at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., Mr. JOHN BENTLEY to RACHEL, daughter of Mr. J. HELME, both of Egerton.

Nov. 18, at Skewen church, near Neath, PHILIP HENRY ROWLAND, Esq., of Neath, to LUCY, daughter of the late Henry HICKES, Esq., of Worcester.

At the Old meeting, Birmingham, by Rev. Charles Clarke, Mr. GEORGE HATTON to EMILY, fourth daughter of the late Mr. Richard TIMMINS.

Dec. 22, at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., Mr. THOS. TAYLOR to SARAH ANN, daughter of Mr. John CRANE, of Egerton.

Dec. 2, at the Unitarian church, Swansea, by Rev. E. Higginson, Mr. JOHN JONES, artist, to Miss ELIZABETH ROBINSON, both of Swansea.

Dec. 16, at the Unitarian chapel, Essex Street, by Rev. Dr. Harrison, RICHARD BROWN EVERED, Esq., to Miss SARAH G. KENT.